Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa

Prof. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer

Deptt. of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages
Lucknow University,
Lucknow

Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa

Prof. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer

Deptt. of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages
Lucknow University
Lucknow

Publishers :
Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages
Lucknow University
Lucknow

© Deptt. of Sanskrit and
Prakrit Languages
Lucknow University
Lucknow

First Edition : 2003

Price : Rs. 95.00

Printed at
Pnar Offset
'Indra-Anushthan'
Gwynne Road, Aminabad
Lucknow
Ph. : 2213565, 2223757

प्रकाशकीयम्

संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागोऽयं लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राचीनतमेषु सुप्रतिष्ठितेषु च विभागेष्वस्त्यन्यतमः। एतस्य विभागस्य प्रायः ८२ वर्षीयसुदीर्घ-जीवनावधेरिदमस्त्यत्यन्तपावनं गौरवपूर्णं च क्षणम्, यतो ह्येतस्मिन्नेव क्षणे विभागोऽयमिदम्प्रथमतया ग्रन्थप्रकाशनकर्मणि सफलतापूर्वकमवतीर्णो विराजते। विंशशताब्द्या एकविंशे वर्षे जुलाईमासे लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयस्य स्थापना सञ्जातेति तु विदितमेवाऽस्ति विश्वविद्यालयीयैतिह्यज्ञानाम्। यैः कतिपयविभागैः सह विश्वविद्यालयेनाऽनेन तदानीं कार्यम् आरब्धम्, तेषु संस्कृतविभागोऽयमासीत् प्रमुखतमः। तस्मिन्नेव वर्षे प्रो. कोडुवायूर-अनन्तराम-सुब्रह्मण्य-अय्यर-महाभागैर् इदम्प्रथमतया विभागस्याऽध्यक्षपदम् अङ्गीकृतम्। गम्भीरा-ऽध्ययनाऽध्यापनस्योत्कृष्टाऽनुसन्धानकार्यस्य च निदर्शनभूतं खल्वासीदेतेषां प्रभावि व्यक्तित्वम्। भर्तृहरेर्वाक्यपदीयमधिकृत्य सम्पादितमेतेषामनुसन्धानकार्यम् अद्याप्यसमम् अद्वितीयञ्चाऽस्ति। एतद्विरचिता बहवो लेखाः तदानीन्तन-शोधपत्रिकासु प्रसिद्धासु प्रकाशिता अभूवन्निति वृत्तं तु केवलं वरिष्ठवरिष्ठा विद्वांस एव जानन्ति। 'Journal of Oriental Research' इति नामधेया काचिदासीदत्यन्तप्रसिद्धा तदानीं शोधपत्रिका। पत्रिकायामस्यां विद्वद्वर्याणाम् अय्यरमहानुभावानां 'Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa इति नामधेयो विस्तृतो शोधलेखः क्रमशः प्रकाशितोऽभूत्। पत्रिकाया अस्याः सम्बद्धाङ्का अप्यद्य सुदुर्लभाः सञ्जाताः। किन्त्वस्मत्सौभाग्येन लखनऊ-नगरस्थायाम् अखिल- भारतीयसंस्कृतपरिषदि विराजते प्रो. अय्यरमहाभागनां वैयक्तिकोऽपूर्वश्च ग्रन्थसंग्रहः। संस्कृतपरिषदः संस्थापकाः खल्वासन्नेते प्रो. अय्यरमहाभागाः। परिषदोऽस्याः सौजन्यात् संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागोऽयं

कथञ्चिदधिगतवान् लेखानिमान्। त एव लेखा अद्य प्रकाशनकर्मणि प्रवृत्तेन विभागेनाऽनेन आचार्यस्मृतिग्रन्थमालायाः प्रथमपुष्पतया ग्रन्थरूपेण प्रकाश्यन्त इति सन्तुष्यामो वयम्। ग्रन्थोऽयं विषयमर्मज्ञेषु विद्वत्सु सहृदयेषु चाऽवश्यं समादृतो भविष्यतीत्यस्ति मदीयः सुदृढो विश्वासः।

डॉ. अशोककुमार कालिया
आचार्योऽध्यक्षश्च, संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागः
लखनऊ-विश्वविद्यालयः, लखनऊ

❑ ❑ ❑

Studies in the Imagery of the *Kāmāyaṇa*

Prof. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer
Founder Head, Deptt. of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, Lucknow University

I

Despite the Dhvanivāda, which assigns a subordinate place to *Alankāras* or figurative images, both poets and critics have always shown immense interest in them in India. Bharata, the earliest of the known writers who deal with the subject of Alankāras, recognises four of them in his *Nāṭyaśāstra*,[1] but their number went on increasing, until it reached the respectable number of 125 in the *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Dīkṣita, without, of course, counting the Sub-divisions. The last great work belonging to the *Alankāraśāstra*, the *Rasagangādhara* of Jagannāthapaṇdita, written long after the *Dhvanivāda* had received almost universal recognition at the hands of poets and critics is primarily a detailed study of the *Alankāras*. It is not merely critics who take delight in defining and analysing these figures of speech, but poets also exhibit a weakness for them throughtout the whole period of Sanskrit literature. Nor is there anything surprising in this. Figurative imagery is bound to have its place in all good poetry. Even critics like the *Dhvanivādin-s*, who have declared that poetry has a higher function to perform than the mere presentation

1. Bharata-*Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI. (Benares Edition).
S. K. De. *Sanskrit Poetics* II, p. 6.

of beautiful imagery, have admitted that imagery, if carefully used, can serve this very higher purpose.

The interest of our critics, from Bharata to Jagannātha-paṇḍita, has, however, been in the form of the *Alankāra-s*. It must be admitted that our *Ālankārikas* have bequeathed to us a very deep, penetrating and detailed analysis of the *forms* that Sanskrit imagery can assume. Great efforts were made to distinguish one form from another. In later times, all the devices provided by the *Navīnanyāya* for reaching extreme accuracy in definitions were adopted for the purpose. The history of the *Alankāraśāstra* is, to a very great extent, the history of the discovery of newer and newer forms of images, of a more and more scientific basis for classifying them and of the formulation of more and more accurate definitions of them. Appayya Dikṣita's *"Citramīmāmsā"* and Jagannāthapaṇḍita's *"Raṣagangādhara"* are indications of the kind of controversies that must have been carried on in circles of critics in ancient India.

There is, however, something more than form in any given image. An image usually involves a comparison and a comparison presupposes three things :- the object of comparison (the *upameya*) the standard of comparison, (the *upamāna*) and the point of similarity (the *samānadharma*). These might be called the contents of an image. The contents might remain the same while the form varies and the form might remain the same, while the contents vary. The following passage from the *"Citramīmāmsā"* would make this quite clear :-

चन्द्र इव मुखमिति सादृश्यवर्णनं तावदुपमा। सैवोक्तिभङ्गीभेदेनानेकालंकारभावं भजते। तथा हि– "चन्द्र इव मुखं मुखमिव चन्द्रः" इत्युपमेयोपमा। "मुखं मुखमिव" इत्यनन्वयः। "मुखमिव चन्द्रः" इति प्रतीपम्। "चन्द्रं दृष्टवा मुखं स्मरामि" इति स्मरणम्। "मुखमेव चन्द्रः" इति रूपकम्। "मुखचन्द्रेण तापः शाम्यति" इति परिणामः। "किमिदं

मुखमुताहो चन्द्रः'' इति सन्देहः।[1]

In the above passage, the contents of all the figures of speech are the same, namely, the face and the moon; but the form varies according as it is *upamā*, or *rūpaka* or something else.

The *Alaṅkāraśāstra* is essentially an analysis of the form of the images. This analysis was undertaken partly to satisfy a natural intellectual curiosity and partly, because, it was felt that it had something to do with the aesthetic pleasure we feel when we come across a beautiful image. It may be admitted that it has something to do with it. How else can we explain the different effect on us of the different figures of speech even when the contents remain the same? But one may also ask the question : have not the contents also something to do with it? When Kālidāsa writes :-

अथ वा कृतवाग्द्वारे वंशेऽस्मिन् पूर्वसूरिभिः।
मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः।।[2]

Do we like the comparison-only because it has taken the form of *upamā*, or also, because, of its appropriateness i.e., for its contents ?

We cannot doubt that our *Ālaṅkārika-s* had recognised the share of the contents in making an image beautiful. According to Bhāmaha, the defects of an *upamā*, as mentioned by Medhāvin, are as follows :-

हीनतासंभवो लिङ्गवचोभेदो विपर्ययः।
उपमानाधिकत्वं च तेनासदृशतापि च।।[3]

Vamāna's list is almost identical :-

---

1. *Citramimāmsā*, p. 6, (Nirnaya Sāgara Press Edition).
2. *Raghu.* I, 4.
3. *Bhāmahalankāra*, II. 39.

हीनत्वाधिकत्वलिङ्गवचनभेदासादृश्यासम्भवास्तद्दोषाः[1]।

It will be observed that these are defects in the contents of the *upamā* and not in the *form*. Appayya Dikṣita puts the whole thing in a more positive form when he says :-

उपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरर्थयोर्द्वयोः।
हृद्यं साधर्म्यमुपमेत्युच्यते काव्यवेदिभिः।।

कविसमयप्रसिद्धयनुरोधेनोपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरेव साधर्म्यमुपमा। न त्वतथाभूतयोः। अत एव "कुमुदमिव मुखं प्रसन्नम्" इत्यादि नोपमा। तथाभूतयोरपि वस्तुत्वद्रव्यत्वादिकृतमहृद्यं साधर्म्यं न तथा। किं तु हृद्यमेव कान्तिमत्त्वादिकम्। सर्वोऽपि ह्यलंकारः कविसमयप्रसिद्धयनुरोधेन हृद्यतया काव्यशोभाकर एवालंकारतां भजते। अतः "गोसदृशो गवयः" इति नोपमा। "गौर्वाहीकः" इति न रूपकम्। "स्थाणुर्वा पुरुषो वा" इति न सन्देहः। "इदं रजतं" इति न भ्रान्तिमान्। "नायं सर्पः" इति नापह्नुतिः। "पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते" इति न पर्यायोक्तम्। "पर्वतो वह्निमान्" इति नानुमानम्। "स देवदत्तः" इति न स्मरणम्। "तस्य स्थमिपां तांतंतामः" इति न यथासंख्यम्। "पुत्रेण सहागतः पिता" इति न सहोक्तिः। "तेन विना गतः" इतिं न विनोक्तिः। "श्वेतां धावति" इति न श्लेषः[2]।

The meaning of this passage cannot be mistaken. There is here recognition, in theory at least, of the importance of the pleasure we feel when we come across a good image. A recent English writer says :- "What precisely is the origin of the pleasure we take in the pictures of metaphor and simile, as distinct from unfigurative word-picture ? I think that, over and above the delight in a picture, there is a little shock or surprise caused by the unexpected rapprochement of two notions that seemed, a moment before, unconnected and remote from one another. The noticing of likenesses (need 1 refer to babies ?) would seem an ever-fresh source of pleasure - we call comprisons odious, but love

1. Vamana's *Kāvyādankārasūtra Vṛtti*, IV, ii, 8.
2. *Citramīmānsā*, p. 6.

them none the less. And when the likeness in perceived in the midst of unlikeness, perhaps even despite obvious and preponderating unlikeness, perhaps even despite obvious and preponderating unlikeness, the pleasure is proportionately greater."[1]

In spite of this theoretical recognition of the importance of the *contents* for the beauty of an image, we find in our *Alaṅkāraśāstra* no study, no analysis of them. But if it is true that the contents have something to do with the pleasure we derive from beautiful images and if it is true that imagery has played a conspicuous part in all periods of Sanskrit literature, then such an analysis of the contents of the images might yield interesting results. It should, it seems to me, throw some light on the history of Sanskrit literature. It would show to what extent the contents vary or remain the same in the different authors and periods of Sanskrit literature. Explanation would have to be sought for the variation or the repetition, as the case may be. It would show the range of the poetic power of the different writers and their relation to one another. It might throw some light on the relation between *form* and *content* in the evolution of the images. In short, no history of Sanskrit literature could be considered complete which did not include a historical treatment of Sanskrit imagery, from the point of view of form as well as of content. In the existing works on the History of Sanskrit literature, such as those of Professors Keith and Winternitz, there are, no doubt, many interesting remarks on the imagery of Sanskrit poets, but no systematic treatment. The task is a big one, but a beginning has to be made. The following pages are no more than an humble attempt at such a beginning. I have thought it best to begin with the Vālmīki-*Rāmāyaṇa*[2], because it is there that we find

1. Stephen. J. Brown. *"The World or Imagery."* London 1927.
2. The Bombay Recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has been used for this study.

the beginnings of *Kāvya*.

The first step in the study of the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is to determine the occasions on which the images appear in the work. As every one knows, the work is an immense one. As one reads it, all sorts of scenes pass before one's eyes. There are descriptions of cities and landscapes, fierce *rākṣasas* and mighty monkeys. There are moving scenes in which husband and wife, father and son, master and servant, king and subject, prince and priest take part and give expression to their innermost feelings. There are moving scenes in which husband and wife, father and son, master and servant, king and subject, prince and priest take part and give expression to their innermost feelings. There are accounts of duels and battles, devastation of countries, burning of cities and ruthless destruction of armies by weapons, human and divine. There are speeches born of indignation and anger, lamentations expressive of profound sorrow, and exhortations of wisdom. With all this, the work is mainly a continuous narrative of events, big and small. Into the main story of Rāma and his exploits are woven countless episodes centering round the minor characters of the work. The question before us, however, is : In all this variety and richness of subject-matter, what are the occasions which particularly call forth imagery from the poet? In answer to this, it may be stated, in a general manner, that images are found throughout the work. There is hardly a *sarga* in which at least a few comparisons do not occur. They may not always be very striking, they are often mere repetitions of quite commonplace images like कमलपत्राक्ष, इन्दीवरश्याम, राजीवलोचन, नरशार्दूल, मुनिपुंगव, देवसंकाश etc. Our interest lies not in these, but in those which occur on special occasions. For, there are some occasions on which these images seem to come in quick succession and in greater abundance. It is these which are striking

and arrest our attention. It is these which seem to have been introduced by the poet deliberately, with a full knowledge of the effect they will have on the hearer or the reader. I give below a list of passages in which the images are thus more striking. It is by no means an exhaustive list, but, I hope, sufficiently complete, not to invalidate any conclusion that may be drawn from it.

I. 18, 50-52	...	Daśaratha describes his joy on the arrival of Viśvāmitra and compares the occasion to others.
I. 48, 2-5	...	Sumati asks Viśvāmitra who Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are, while describing them.
I. 49, 14-15	...	Description of Ahalyā as Rāma sees her.
I. 55, 9-10	...	Description of Viśvāmitra, defeated and humiliated by Vasiṣṭha.
II. 1.	...	Description of Rāma by Daśaratha.
II. 2.	...	Description of Rāma by the people.
II. 3, 27-29.	...	Description of Rāma as Daśaratha sees him coming.
II. 4, 5, 6.	...	Description of the preparations for the *abhiṣeka* of Rāma as *Yuvarāja*.
II. 7, 1-30	...	Mantharā's speech to Kaikeyi on hearing of Rāma's coronation.
II. 8.	...	Mantharā's speech.
II. 9, 41-46.	...	Kaikeyī's description of Mantharā.
II. 10, 23-26.	...	Description of Kaikeyī in distress.
II. 12.		Speech of Daśaratha on hearing of Kaikeyī's two boons.
II. 15.		Sumantra's description of Rāma's palace.

II. 16, 9 f.f.		Sumantra's description of Rāma.
II. 16.		Poet's description of Rāma as he goes out to meet Daśaratha.
II. 18, 4-7.		Description of Daśaratha in distress.
II. 20, 32-34	...	Description of Kausalyā in distress.
II. 20, 9-55	...	Kausalyā's lamentation on hearing of Rāma's exile.
II. 34, 2-3.	...	Description of Daśaratha in distress.
II. 40.	...	Departure of Rāma.
II. 43.	...	Lamentation of Kausalyā.
II. 59, 28-30	...	Lamentation of Daśaratha.
II. 65, 66.	...	Lamentation of Daśaratha's wives after his death.
II. 73, 1-5.	...	Bharata's indignation on hearing Rāma's exile.
II. 93, 8-15.	...	Description of Citrakūṭa by Bharata.
II. 94.	...	Description of Citrakūṭa by Rāma.
III. 16.	...	Description of winter in Pañcavaṭī.
III. 19, 3-4.	...	Khara's speech on seeing Sūrpaṇakhā mutilated.
III. 26,27,28,29,30...		Description of battle between Rāma and the Rākṣasas.
III. 31, 41-44.	...	Mārīca's advice to Rāvaṇa not to take Sītā away.
III. 38		
III. 37, 12-20	...	Mārīca's second speech to the same effect.
III. 47, 32 f.f.	...	Sītā's reply when Rāvaṇa proposes

marriage.

III. 51. ... Battle between Jaṭāyus and Rāvaṇa.

III. 52. ... Description of the ravishment of Sītā.

III. 52. ... Sītā's reply to Rāvaṇa's proposal of marriage.

IV. 14, 19-23. ... Sugrīva going out for battle.

IV. 15, 19-21. ... Description of Rāma by Tārā.

IV. 17, 1 f.f. ... Description of fallen Vālin.

IV. 19, 21-26. ... " " " by Tārā.

IV. 23, 22-28. ... Lamentation of Tārā.

IV. 28. ... Description of the rainy season.

IV. 29. ... " " " autumn.

V. 1. ... " Hanumān's leap across the ocean.

V. 2. ... " Laṅkā by Hanumān.

V. 4. ... " Laṅkā.

V. 5. ... " A moonlit night.

V. 6. ... " Rāvaṇa's palace.

V. 7. ... " " "

V. 9. ... " " harem.

V. 10. ... " " "

V. 14. ... " Aśokavana.

V. 15. ... " Sītā in distress.

V. 18. ... " Rāvaṇa's visit to Sītā.

V. 19. ... " Sītā in distress.

V. 21. ... Sītā's reply to Rāvaṇa's proposal.

V. 22. ... Speeches of Rāvaṇa and Sītā.

V. 28. ... Sītā's lamentation.

V. 56.	...	Description of mountain.
V. 57.	...	" Hanumān's return leap.
VI. 5.	...	Rāma's lamentation.
VI. 16.	...	Rāvaṇa's indignant speech to Vibhīṣaṇa.
VI. 24.	...	Rāvaṇa's angry speech to Śuka.
VI. 53.	...	Battle between Vajradaṃṣṭra and Śuka.
VI. 58.	...	" Prahasta and Nīla.
VI. 59.	...	Description of Rākṣasas.
VI. 61.	...	Description of Kumbhakarṇa.
VI. 71.	...	" Atikāya.
VI. 102.	...	Fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa.
VI. 103.	...	" " "
VI. 111.	...	Vibhīṣaṇa's lamentation on the death of Rāvaṇa.

Before explaining the above list, it must be stated that the bulk of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is made up of narratives, written in a simple style, in which the story progresses from incident to incident and episode to episode. Interspersed among these narratives and forming, on the whole, *only a minor portion of the work* are some speeches and descriptions. It is quite clear from the above list that the images, when they do occur in greater abundance and in a striking manner, occur in these speeches and descriptions and not in the narrative portion of the work, which is devoted to the telling of the story. It is in these speeches and descriptions that we have to see the beginnings of the later-*Kāvyas*, in very many of which the narrative portion is reduced to the absolute minimum and the speeches and descriptions occupy the whole work.

Taking the speeches first, it will be found that they are generally uttered by the characters under the stress of some *emotion*. Somtimes it is *jealousy*, as in the case of Mantharā who addresses Kaikeyī when she hears of Rāma's impending coronation as Yuvarāja. Sometimes it is *sorrow*, as when Daśaratha and Kausalyā lament about Rāma's exile or when Tārā laments on the death of Vālin. Sometimes it is *righteous indignation*, as when Bharata hears of Rāma's exile or when Sītā rejects Rāvaṇa's proposal of marriage. Sometimes it is *pity*, as when Mārīca tries to dissuade Rāvaṇa from his scheme of taking Sītā away. These emotions spontaneously call forth imagery from the poet. The images are generally of a homely nature and therefore, very effective in expressing the emotion in question. Sītā's speech in III, 47 – when Rāvaṇa proposes marriage is a very good example.

This connection between image and emotion is, by the way, quite interesting, because it is one of the topics dealth with in the *Dhvanyāloka*.[1] Ānandavardhana is, on the whole, rather suspicious. He is afraid that too many images in a passage meant to evoke sentiment might distract the attention of the reader away from the latter. He advises caution, without barring images altogether. He sums up his views as follows :–

ध्वन्यात्मभूते शृङ्गारे समीक्ष्य विनिवेशितः।
रूपकादिरलंकारवर्ग एति यथार्थताम्।।
विवक्षा तत्परत्वेन नाङ्गित्वेन कथंचन।
काले च ग्रहणत्यागौ नातिनिर्वहणैषिता।।
निर्व्यूदढावपि चाङ्गत्वे यत्रेन प्रत्यवेक्षणम्।
रूपकादेरलंकारवर्गस्याङ्गत्वसाधनम्।।[2]

This errs perhaps on the side of caution. The English

1. *Dhvanyāloka*, p. 85 f.f.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 88

writer quoted above goes much farther when he writes :– "The more emotion grows upon a man, the more his speech, if he makes any effort to express his emotion, abounds in figures– exclamation, interrogation, anacoluthon, apostrophe, hyperbole (yes certainly, hyperbole 1) simile, metaphor. His language is what we sometimes euphemestically describe as 'picturesque'. Feelings swamp ideas and language is used to express, not the reality of things, but the state of one's emotions."[1]

I must not be understood to say that *all* emotional speeches in the *Rāmāyaṇa* abound in figurative images. I only mean that they have a *strong tendency to do so*. There are some expections. For example, there is the first reply of Daśaratha to Viśvāmitra when the latter asks for Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to be sent with him for the protection of his sacrifice. The request must have given a shock to Daśaratha and his reply is, no doubt, full of emotions, but there is hardly any image in it.

The description in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are of a most straight-forward nature, much as we would expect them to be when art is in the first stage. All the things contained in the thing to be described are enumerated in detail. No attempt seems to have been made to pick and choose. One could say they are almost like cataogues, if the word did not connote absolute absence of poetic merit. The following description of *Citrakūṭa* by Rāma might be considered a typical one :–

पश्येममचलं भद्रे ! नानाद्विजगणायुतम् ।
शिखरैः खमिवोद्विद्धैर्धातुमद्भिर्विभूषितम् ।।
केचिद्रजतसंकाशाः केचित् क्षतजसन्निभाः ।
पीतमाञ्जिष्ठवर्णाश्च केचिन्मणिवरप्रभाः ।।
पुष्पार्ककेतकाभाश्च केचिज्ज्योतीरसप्रभाः ।

1. *The world of Imagery*, p. 90.

विराजतेऽचलेन्द्रस्य देशा धातुविभूषिताः।
नानामृगगणैर्द्वीपितरक्ष्वृक्षगणैर्वृताः।
अदुष्टैर्भात्ययं शैलो बहुपक्षिसमाकुलः।।
आम्रजम्ब्वसनैर्लोध्रैः प्रियालैः पनसैर्धवैः।
अङ्कोलैर्भात्यतिनिशैर्बिल्वतिन्दुकवेणुभिः।।
काश्मर्यारिष्टवरणैर्मधूकैस्तिलकैरपि।
बदर्यामलकैर्नीपैर्वेत्रधन्वनबीजकैः।।
पुष्पवद्भिः फलोपेतैः छायावद्भिर्मनोरमैः।
एवमादिभिराकीर्णः श्रियं पुष्यत्ययं गिरिः।।[1]

This passage illustrates not only the detailed, catalogue-like nature of the description, but also their *directness*. When the poet wants to say that there are wild animals on the mountain, he says, quite directly : "नानामृगगणैर्द्वीपितरक्ष्वृक्षगणैर्वृतः". This point will become still clearer when we compare this with what Kālidāsa does in similar circumstances. When he wants to say that there are lions and elephants on the Himalaya, he does not say so directly, but says :–

पदं तुषारस्रुतिधौतरक्तं यस्मिन्नदृष्ट्वापि हतद्विपानाम्।
विन्दन्ति मार्गं नखरन्ध्रमुक्तैर्मुक्ताफलैः केसरिणः किराताः।।[2]

It is into such direct and detailed descriptions that the poet, introduces his imagery, which therefore, serves, chiefly, to add vividness to the details and lend a certain picturesquences to the whole description. How this is done can be best understood if we now study the contents of the images.

II

It was shown in the preceeding article that our Ālaṅkārikas, as well as modern critics, recognize that the

1. *Rāmā*, II. 9, 4-10.
2. *Kumārasambhava*, I, 6.

contents of a poet's imagery have as much to do with the pleasure we derive from it as its form. The study of these contents is, however, beset with many difficulties. The most important of them all is their extra-ordinary richness and variety. The sources of poetic imagery are virtually inexhaustible. They are co-extensive with the universe. The only possible limitation is the limitation of the poet's genius and experience. A gifted poet can compare any two things in the world. He can see resemblance where our eyes fail to detect any. Nor does he follow any fixed rules in the choice of the contents of his images. The thing compared, the object to which it is compared and the point of comparison- all follow the needs of the occasion and nothing more. To analyse and classify the sources of a poet's imagery is, to say the least, a laborious task.

As in the case of the other poets of India or for the matter of that, of the world, external nature forms the chief source of the imagery of Vālmīki. Mountains and rivers, birds and animals, trees and forests, all the infinite variety of creation provides innumerable points of comparison to our author. So do the celestial bodies like the sun and the moon, the stars and the planets figure constantly in the descriptions and speeches of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Equally prominent in the imagery of the poet are the natural phenomena of the sky, thunder and lightning, clouds and rain, rainbows and comets. Closely connected with nature is religion as a source of imagery. This is natural as epic religion is only a development of Vedic religion, which, as every one knows, is essentially a worship of the powers of nature personified. Not only do the higher gods like Indra, Viṣṇu and Varuṇa, but a host of minor gods and semi-divine beings, Yakṣa-s, Kinnara-s, Gandharva-s and similar beings play an important part in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. They form a world of their own,

a world not absolutely inacessible to man, but inhabited by beings who communicate often with men and interfere in their lives and *vice-versa*. If Indra, the god, helps human beings to win battles against their enemies, Daśaratha, the human King, also goes to help Indra in his fight against the Asura-s. There is no very clear line of demarcation between our world and the world of gods and demi-gods. A god can become a man and a man can turn into a god according to his deeds and even without any such transformation, there is constant communication between the two worlds.

It is not merely religion considered as a body of conceptions which is a rich source of imagery to the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but its ritualistic side also occasionally furnishes a comparison or two. Thus, when Bharata returns to Ayodhyā, the city is all silent like an altar after the scarifice is over, empty of all sacrificial utensils and abandoned by the priests[1]. Sometimes, though very rarely, the poet turns to scholarly traditions for his comparisons. When Hanumān sees Sītā in the Aśokavana, in a state of extreme distress, devoid of all ornaments, looking very different from what she should, she is compared to a word which expresses a meaning different from its real one, when it is deprived of its correct grammatical form.[2] Equally rare are images of an abstract nature, drawn from the subjective experience of man. The quote an example or two, Sītā in distress is compared to Hope baffled[3], to Faith destroyed[4],

---

1. त्यक्तां यज्ञायुधैः सर्वैरभिरूपैश्च याजकैः।
सुत्याकाले सुनिर्वृत्ते वेदिं गतरवामिव।। *Rāmā* II - 114-8.
2. दुःखेन बुबुधे सीतां हनूमाननलंकृताम्।
संस्कारेण यथा हीनां वाचमर्थान्तरं गताम्।। *Ibid.*, V - 15-39.
3. आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V - 19-11.
4. विहतामिव च श्रद्धाम्। *Ibid.*, V - 15-33.

to Wisdom in decay[5], and to an Order disobeyed[6]. In this connection, one might also mention a few figures drawn from sea-life, though they are also quite rare. Thus Sita in distress is like a boat in the middle of the ocean, buffeted by the winds[7].

The rarity of the images drawn from these latter sources does not cause any particular surprise. What strikes one, however, is the extraordinary scarcity, amounting almost to complete absence, of comparisons drawn from ancient legends and heroic tales. While works like the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* have been a prolific source of imagery to later writers, one would think, while reading the *Rāmāyaṇa*, that no heroic literature existed at all before it. Countless, indeed, are the occasions when the characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa* could have been compared to heroes of old, but instead, they are likened to gods and demi-gods, rivers and mountains, birds and beasts. The difference in this respect, between the the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the later works may be illustrated by the following passage from the *Buddacarita* of *Aśvaghoṣa*. The occasion is the advice of Udāyī to Gotama who shows indifference to the pleasures of love. Udāyī mentions the names of great people who set much value by such pleasures. He says :–

कामं परमिति ज्ञात्वा देवोऽपि हि पुरंदरः।
गौतमस्य मुनेः पत्नीमहल्यां चकमे पुरा।।
अगस्त्यः प्रार्थयामास सोमभार्यां च रोहिणीम्।
तस्मात्तत्सदृशं लेभे लोपामुद्रामिति श्रुतिः।।
औतथ्यस्य च भार्यायां ममतायां महातपाः।
मारुत्यां जनयामास भरद्वाजं बृहस्पतिः।।
बृहस्पतेर्महिष्यां च जुहत्यां जुहतां वरः।

5. प्रज्ञामिव परिक्षीणाम्। *Ibid.*, V - 19-11.
6. आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V - 19-12.
7. वायुवेगैरिवाक्रान्तां मज्जन्तीं नावमर्णवे। *Ibid.*, III - 55.4, IV - 5.

बुधं विबुधधर्माणं जनयामास चन्द्रमाः।।
कालीं चैव पुरा कन्यां जलप्रभवसंभवाम्।
जगाम यमुनातीरे जातरागः पराशरः।।
मातङ्गयामक्षमालायां गर्हितायां रिरंसया।
कपिञ्जलादं तनयं वसिष्ठोऽजनयन्मुनिः।।
ययातिश्चैव राजर्षिर्वयस्यपि विनिर्गते।
विश्वाच्याप्सरसा सार्धं रेमे चैत्ररथे वने।।
स्त्रीसंसर्गं विना शान्तं पाण्डुर्ज्ञात्वापि कौरवः।
माद्रीरूपगुणाक्षिप्तः सिषेवे कामजं सुखम्।।
करालजनकश्चैव हृत्वा ब्राह्मणकन्यकाम्।
अवाप भ्रंशमप्येव न तु त्यजेच्च मन्मथम्।।
एवमाद्या महात्मानो विषयान् गर्हितानपि।
रतिहेतोर्बुभुजिरे प्रागेव गुणसंहितान्।।[1]

Such passages, full of allusions to old heroes are hardly ever met with in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

So much for the sources of Vālmikī's imagery. Another question which constantly arises in our minds while reading the *Rāmāyaṇa* is : how far is the imagery found in the work, the product of Vālmikī's own imagination and how far is it just his literary inheritance? A very large number of images found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are found in the *Mahābhārata* also and one feels they would be found in other works of a similar nature and of the same period, if we could but see them. With regard to these, one feels that they are not anybody's property in particular, but belong to the people as a whole. They must have occurred frequently in the ordinary speech of the people and probably do so even now. They can all be explained by reference to human nature and the character of the country in which Vālmikī and other poets lived. They are of a very simple nature and involve only the most obvious and conspicuous attributes of things visible

1. *B.C.* IV - 72-81.

to anybody and not only to the poet of gesniur. The fact that they are found in other works than the *Rāmāyaṇa* has to be explained and it seems to me that rather than assuming borrowal on the one side or the other, it would be safer to refer them all to a common source. namely, popular imagination and tradition. It would be a very long task to make a complete list of such images but, for the purposes of illustration, I am giving a few of them, taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārta*, in which there are similar situations. giving rise to similar images. Thus, in both, a man's voice is compared to the roaring of clouds[1]; in both, one trembles like a *kadalī* shaken in the wind[2], *Damayantī* separated from Nala and Sītā separated from Rāma are both very distressd and in their distress, they are likened to a lotus-bed spoiled by an elephant with all its leaves and lotuses pulled out, and its birds frightened away[3], or they are compared to a dried-up river[4], or to the moon hidden by black clouds. In both, a place that has lost its original beauty or greatness is compared to a lake devoid of its snakes[5], or an empty wine jar!

1. दुन्दुभिस्वरकल्पेन गम्भीरेणानुनादिना।
स्वरेण महता राजा जीमूत इव नादयन्। *Rāmā*. II - 2-20.
यदि मां मेघनिर्घोषो नोपगच्छति नैषधः।
अद्य चामीकरप्रख्यं प्रवेक्ष्यामि हुताशनम्।। *M. Bhā*. III - 7-11.

2. कम्पमानेव कदली वातेनाभिसमीरिता।
कृष्णा राजानमासाद्य शोकार्ता न्यपतद्भुवि। *Ibid*., X - 11-7.
सीता प्रवेपितोद्वेगात् प्रवाते कदली यथा।। *Rāma*. III - 2-15.

3. विध्वस्तपर्णकमलां वित्रासितविहङ्गमाम्।
हस्तिहस्तपरिक्लिष्टां व्याकुलामिव पद्मिनीम्।। *M. Bhā*. III - 65-20.
उत्कृष्टपर्णकमलां वित्रासितविहङ्गमाम्।
हस्तिहस्तपरामृष्टामाकुलामिव पद्मिनीम्।। *Rāmā*. V - 19-15.

4. पतिशोकाकुलां दीनां कृशस्रोतां नदीमिव। *M. Bhā*. III - 65-19.
उपक्षीणामिवापगाम्। *Rāma*. V - 19-14.

5. गतोत्सवं पुरमिव हृतनागमिव ह्रदम्। *Ibid*., IX - 63-5.
महाह्रदमिवाक्षोभ्यं सुपर्णेन हृतोरगम्। *Rāma*.,

The list can be indefinitely lengthened. As to the other question, namely, when are we to know that an image is the product of Vālmikī's own imagination, the answer is not easy to give. To say positively that it occurs nowhere else than in the *Rāmāyaṇa* would necessitate a very laborious research and one is not quite certain that the result would be quite decisive. Mere presence or absence of an image in other works than the *Rāmāyaṇa* would be no proof of its popular origin or otherwise. Here we shall have to rely more on the nature of the image itself. Popular images are likely to be of a simple nature. Complex images are likely to be the products of particular minds. There are also some images which are not exactly complex, but so stricking, so beautiful, so peculiar that one feels they cannot have mere popular origin. One feels that not everybody can think of them. I realise that the test is rather subjective, but I also feel that in some cases at least, it is an unfailing test. When we are told that some one is as tall as a tree, or as huge as a mountain, or as lustrous as the sun, or as swift as the wind, or as deep as the ocean, we are not taking any undue risk in declaring that these are popular images, that we cannot say who thought of them first, that they are part of the literary heritage of all writers. But when we read in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, in the course of a description of the rainy season, that the sky appears love-sick, with gentle breeze for its sighs, the red lustre of sun-set for its sandal paste and with its pale clouds[1], or that the mountains are like *Brahmacārin*-s, for they have dark clouds for *kṛṣṇājina*, streams of water for sacred thread and their caves are filled with wind, which is their *praṇāyāma*[2], or that the sky seems to be in agony, for it groans in the form of thunder when it is lashed with golden whips in

1. मन्दमारुतनिश्वासं सन्ध्याचन्दनरञ्जितम्।
आपाण्डुजलदं भाति कामातुरमिवाम्बरम्।। *Rāmā.*, IV - 28-6.

2. मेघकृष्णाजिनधरा धारायज्ञोपवीतिनः।
मारुतापूरितगुहाः प्राधीता इव पर्वताः।। *Ibid.*, IV - 28-10.

the form of flashes of lightning[1], we may be certain we are dealing with the products of Vālmīki's own imagination. These are instances of continues of continued metaphors, or metaphors worked out in detail and though an element or two in each metaphor may be of a popular nature, the combination of the different elements into a whole is the work of the poet. Thus, when we read that the night looks like a woman dressed in white silk, with the moon for face, stars for eyes, and moonlight for white silk[2], the indentification of the moon with the face is only the reversal of the well-known identification of the face with the moon. These complex metaphors are not always so pretty as those given above. Sometimes one feels that identifications are made merely for the sake of symmetry and therefore lose their charm. Thus there is a laborious and rather ingenious identification of a battle-ground with a river, in which the dead heroes are identified with banks, broken arms with great trees stream of flood with water, Death with the ocean into which it falls, liver and spleen with and mud, scattered entrails with weeds, broken limbs and heads with fish, vultures with swans, herons with *sārasa* birds, human fat with foam etc. etc[3]. This detailed metaphor may not

---

1. कशाभिरिव हैमीभिर्विद्युद्भिरभिताडितम्।
अन्तस्तनितनिर्घोषं सवेदनमिवाम्बरम्।। *Ibid.*, IV - 28-11.

2. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितसौम्यवक्त्रा तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा।
ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी।। *Ibid.*,IV-30-46.

3. हतवीरौघवप्रां तु भग्नायुधमहाद्रुमाम्।
शोणितौघमहातोयां यमसागरगामिनीम्।
यकृत्प्लीहमहापङ्कां विनिकीर्णान्त्रशैवलाम्।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
गृध्रहंसवराकीर्णो कङ्कसारससेविताम्।
मेदः फेनसमाकीर्णामावर्तस्वंननिःस्वनाम्।।
तां कापुरुषदुस्तारां युद्धभूमिमयीं नदीम्।
नदीमिव घनापाये हंससारससेविताम्।।
राक्षसाः कपिमुख्यास्ते तेरुस्तां दुस्तरां नदीम्।। *Ibid.*, IV - 28-11.

rank high as poetry, but it can certainly not be of a popular origin. It is not merely such complex images which must be considered the poet's own creation. There are some others which are so striking that it is difficult to believe that they were just current coin among all poets. I cannot find better illustrations of this than some of the images descriptive of Hanumān's flight across the sea in the Sundarakāṇḍa. The arms of flying Hanumān, stretched out in the air with their five fingers, looked the five-headed snakes issuing out of mountains[1]. His copper-coloured face with its copper-coloured nose looked like the sun reddening at the time of its setting[2]. Flying Hanumān, with his white teeth and his tail encircling him looked like the sun with a halo round it[3]. The wind rushing past his armpits roars like a cloud[4]. Now diving into clouds and now coming out of them, he looked like the moon in its course across the Sky[5]. In his flight, he seemed up the sky, to scratch the moon, to carry the sky away with him with all its stars and the sun[6].

Thus the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is partly popular and partly Vālmīki's own creation. It would now be interesting to enquire what the objects of nature which play an important part in the comparisons of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are and for what reasons.

---

1. तस्याम्बरगतौ बाहू ददृशाते प्रसारितौ।
पर्वताग्राद्विनिष्क्रान्तौ पञ्चास्याविव पन्नगौ। *Rāma* V., 1-54.

2. मुखं नासिकया तस्य ताम्रया ताम्रमाबभौ।
संन्ध्या समभिस्पृष्टं यथा स्यात् सूर्यमण्डलम्।। *Ibid.*, - 1-58.

3. लाङ्गूलचक्रो हनुमाञ्छुक्लदंष्ट्रोऽनिलात्मजः।
व्यरोचत महाप्राज्ञः परिवेषीव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, 1-60.

4. तस्य वानरसिंहस्य प्लवमानस्य सागरम्।
कक्षान्तरगतो वायुर्जीमूत इव गर्जति।। *Ibid.*, 1-62.

5. प्रविशन्नभ्रजालानि निपतंश्च पुनः पुनः।
प्रच्छन्नश्च प्रकाशश्च चन्द्रमा इव दृश्यते।। *Ibid.*, 1-80.

6. ग्रसमान इवाकाशं ताराधिपमिवोल्लिखन्।
हरन्निव सनक्षत्रं गगनं सार्कमण्डलम्।। *Ibid.*, 57-5.

As everybody knows, the work offers us a pageant of heroes and heroic deeds, in which the fortunes of men rise and fall alternately. It abounds in descriptions of men and women in all their physical and moral glory or degradation, when they are flushed with victory or crushed by defeat, when they are fired by courage or shrink in abject terror, when they are moved by love or burnt with hatred. What are the objects whose aid is invoked to describe these situations and what particular attributes in these objects attracted the attention of our author?

The *Rāmāyaṇa* is primarily a story of kings and princes, whether they belong to Ayodhyā or Mithilā or Kiṣkindhā or *Laṅkā*. Many, therefore, are the occasions when royal splendour and dignity have to be described. Kings and princes shine out from among other men by their royal lustre, power, wealth and heroism. The most natural comparison of a king in all his splendour, and a comparison which comes again and again, is the one with the gods, and particularly with Indra. Indra is the king, *par excellence* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[1], and Amarāvatī is the *rājadhānī par excellence*. The king may be a man, or a monkey or a mere *Rākṣasa*, but still the comparison is admissible. Daśaratha shines in the midst of other kings as Indra among other gods. All kings, whether Hindu or barbarian, waited upon Daśaratha as the other gods upon Indra[2]. Rāvaṇa was seated

---

1. स लब्धमानैर्विनयान्वितैर्नृपैः
पुरालयैर्जानपदैश्च मानवैः।
उपोपविष्टैर्नृपतिर्वृतो बभौ
सहस्रचक्षुर्भगवानिवामरैः।। *Ibid.*, II - 1-51.
दिव्यैर्गुणैः शक्रसमो रामः सत्यपराक्रमः।। *Ibid.*, II - 2-28.
अभिभूतमिदं सर्वं विद्रुतं वानरं बलम्।
अस्मिन् प्लवगशार्दूले हते शक्रसमप्रभे।। *Ibid.*, IV - 19-13.
रथेन रामं महता खरस्ततः
समाससादेन्द्र इवोद्यताशनिः।। *Ibid.*, III - 26-38.

2. म्लेच्छाश्चार्याश्च ये चान्ये वनशैलान्तवासिनः।
उपासांचक्रिरे सर्वे तं देवा वासवं यथा।। *Ibid.*, II - 3-26.

amidst his ministers as Vāsava among Maruts[1]. He shines among *Rākṣasa-s* as Indra among Vasus[2]. Rāma takes the feet of Vasiṣṭha as Indra of Bṛhaspati[3]. The point of comparison is usually royal splendour, but sometimes '*vīrya*', heroism or wealth is mentioned. In regard to the latter, Vaiśravaṇa, or course, is the usual standard of comparison, while Viṣṇu also comes in occasionally for '*vīrya*'[4]. As for intelligence, the analogy is always with Bṛhaspati[5]. Some of the other gods are also occasionally mentioned for their different attributes; thus Rāma is dear of the world as Parjanya with his rain[6]; in battle, he is terrible, like the god of Death with his mouth open[7]; Rāvaṇa surrounded by *Rākṣasa-s* is like Rudra surrounded by *Bhūta-s*.

Equally prominent are the comparison of a king in his splendour with the phenomena of the sky, the sun, the moon and the stars. It is but natural that the most brilliant of all celestial bodies should figure in the description of the most brilliant among men and things. Rāma shines like the sun in autumn[8], with

---

1. उपोपविष्टं सचिवैर्मरुद्भिरिव वासवम्।। *Ibid.*, III. 31-4.
2. स रावणः शस्त्रभृतां मनस्विनां महाबलानां समितौ मनस्वी।
तस्यां सभायां प्रभया चकाशे मध्ये वसूनामिव वज्रहस्तः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 1131.
3. पुरोहितस्याग्निसमस्य तस्य वै
बृहस्पतेरिन्द्र इवामराधिपः।
प्रगृह्य पादौ सुसमृद्धतेजसः
सदैव तेनोपविवेश वासवः।। *Ibid.*, II. 104-28.
4. बुद्ध्या बृहस्पतेस्तुल्यो वीर्ये चापि शचीपतेः। *Ibid.*, II. 1-32.
(दशरथः) धनैश्च संग्रहैश्चान्यैः शक्रवैश्रवणोपमः। *Ibid.*, I. 1-6-3.
विष्णुना सदृशो वीर्ये सोमवत् प्रियदर्शनः। *Ibid.*, I. 1-18.
5. बुद्ध्या बृहस्पतेस्तुल्यः। *Ibid.*, II. 2-30.
उत्तरोत्तरयुक्तौ च वक्ता वाचस्पतिर्यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 2-43.
6. मत्तः प्रियतरो लोके पर्जन्य इव वृष्टिमान्। *Ibid.*, II. 1-38.
7. अजेयं समरे घोरं व्यात्ताननमिवाम्बरम्। *Ibid.*, III. 32-6.
8. विद्यासमुदितो रामः शुशुभे भीमविक्रमः। *Ibid.*, I. 22-22.
सहस्ररश्मिर्भगवान् शरदीव दिवाकरः। *Ibid.*, I. 22-23.

Laksmaṇa, they look like the sun and the moon come to earth by chance[1]. Rāvaṇa in his splendour looks like the burning sun;[2] Sugrīva's lustre is like that of the sun[3] Laṅkā with Indrajit shines like the sky with the sun[4]. Some of the actions of kings are likened to those of the Sun. Thus Daśaratha enters his palace as the Sun enters the cloud[5]. Lakṣmaṇa enters Sugrīva's palace unobstructed as the Sun enters the cloud[6]. Mahodara, the Rākṣasa, mounts an elephant as the Sun mounts Mandara[7]. The Sun dissipates darkness, clears the fog, dries up water and scorches the earth and so will Rāma dissipate everybody's grief as soon as he is seen[8], so would Daśaratha remove Kaikeyi's fear[9], so does grief arising from not seeing Rā ma dry up Daśaratha's life[10], and so does grief due to Rāma's departure burn Kausalyā[11]. It is not merely kings and other outstanding

---

1. यदृच्छयेव संप्राप्तौ चन्द्रसूर्यो वसुंधराम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 3-13.
2. तेजोबलसमायुक्तं तपन्तमिव भास्करम्। *Ibid.*, 48-59.
3. ततस्त्विन्द्रजिता लङ्का सूर्यप्रतिमतेजसा।
   रराजाप्रतिवीर्येण द्यौरिवार्केण भास्वता।। *Ibid.*, VI. 73-16.
4. तानुवाच ततः प्राप्तान् राजार्कसदृशप्रभः। *Ibid.*, IV. 38-8.
5. विलपन् प्राविशद्राजा गृहं सूर्य इवाम्बुदम्। *Ibid.*, II. 42-24.
6. सुग्रीवस्य गृहं रम्यं प्रविवेश महाबलः।
   अवार्यमाणः सौमित्रिर्महाभ्रमिव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 33-18.
   तं महाभ्रमिवादित्यस्तेजोविस्तृतरश्मिवान्।
   अग्रजस्यातपं वीरः प्रविवेश महाद्युतिः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 10-7.
7. महोदरस्तु संक्रुद्धः कुञ्जरं पर्वतोपमम्।
   भूयः समधिरुह्याशु मन्दरं रश्मिवानिव।। *Ibid.*, VI. 70-124.
8. दृष्ट एव हि नः शोकमपनेष्यति राघवः।
   तमः सर्वस्य लोकस्य समुद्यन्निव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, II. 83-9.
9. तत्ते ह्यपनयिष्यामि नीहारमिव रश्मिवान्। *Ibid.*, II. 10-40.
10. तस्यादर्शनजः शोकः सुतस्याप्रतिकर्मणः।
    उच्छोषयति वै प्राणान् वारि स्तोकमिवातपः।। *Ibid.*, II. 64-67-68.
11. महीमिमां रश्मिभिरुत्तमप्रभो
    यथा निदाधे भगवान् दिवाकरः। *Ibid.*, II. 43-21.

men, who, by their lustre and brilliance, splendour and dignity, invite comparison with the Sun; anything that shines for any reason whatsoever can be so compared. Thus a king's chariot is often likened to the Sun, probably because of the lavish use of gold and precious stones on it[1]; So is the royal parasol, probably because of its bright colours and round shape[2]; So is a throne, for the same reason perhaps as the chariot[3]; likewise an armour, because it was kept well polished[4]; also ponds owing perhaps to their shiny water[5], and lotuses[6], and palaces[7], and so many other things. Anything in fact and anybody who distinguishes himself and shines out from others of his own kind can be compared to the Sun.

The Moon plays a role similar to that of the Sun, with, of course, some differences. It stands not merely for brilliance and lustre, but also for purity and clearness. Both men and women are compared to the moon whereas, as far as I know, feminine beauty is never compared to the lustre of the Sun. The army, with Rāma as its leader, looked like the autumn night with the moon[8]. Rāma is loved by everybody like the clear moon.

1. ततः सूर्यनिकाशेन रथेन महता नरः। *Ibid.*, III. 28-14.
रथेनादित्यवर्णेन। *Ibid.*, III. 31-34.
काञ्चनं यानं सूर्यसन्निभम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 38-11.
तं रथं सूर्यसंकाशम्। *Ibid.*, II. 40-13.
प्रतपन्तमिवादित्यमन्तरिक्षगतं रथम्। *Ibid.*, II. 5-13.
2. तरुणादित्यसन्निभं छत्रम्। *Ibid.*, III. 5-9.
3. आसीनं सूर्यसंकाशे काञ्चने परमासने। *Ibid.*, III. 32-5.
4. पपात कवचं भूमौ रामस्यादित्यवर्चसम्। *Ibid.*, III. 28-18.
5. तरुणादित्यसंकाशा भान्ति तत्र जलाशयाः। *Ibid.*, IV. 43-41.
6. जले तरुणसूर्याभैः षट्पदाहतकेसरैः।
पङ्कजैः शोभते पम्पा समन्तादभिसंवृता।। *Ibid.*, IV. 1-64.
7. विरराज च तद्वेश्म रश्मिवानिव रश्मिभिः। *Ibid.*, V. 6-40.
8. सा वीरसमिती राज्ञा विरराज व्यवस्थिता।
शशिना शुभनक्षत्रा पौर्णमासीव शारदी।। *Ibid.*, VI. 24-1.

Hanumān, with his troop of monkeys, was like the moon with the stars on a clear night[1]. The comparison of a women's face to the moon is so common that it does not call for any special remark. The special connection between the moon and joy and cheerfulness must, however, be mentioned. Kaikeyī was full of gladness like the digit of the autumn moon[2]. The palace became bright with the rays of joy as the sky does with the rays of the autumn moon[3]. Sītā's face in joy shines like the moon, freed from the jaws of Rāhu[4]. The position of the moon as the brightest celestial body, surrounded by a huge collection of less bright stars marks him out for comparison with anybody who shines out among others of his own kind. Daśaratha enters his palace full of beautifully dressed women and resembling Indra's palace, as the Moon enters the sky full of stars[5].

Needless to say that the brightness and rapidity of lightning bring it also frequently into the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is also natural that women, with their slim and graceful beauty should be compared to it. These thin, graceful and bright flashes of lightning appear among huge, formless and dark clouds and the contrast did not fail to strike Vālmīki. Also, the wriggling motion of a flash of lightning suggests the idea of a slim beauty trying to get out of the grasp of a giant monster. Vālmīki has made full use of this in his description of Rāvaṇa's ravishment

---

1. गताम्बुदे व्योम्नि विशुद्धमण्डलः
शशीव नक्षत्रगणोपशोभितः। *Ibid.*, IV. 44-16.

2. उत्तस्थौ हर्षसंपूर्णा चन्द्रलेखेव शारदी। *Ibid.*, II. 7-31.

3. हर्षरश्मिभिरुद्द्योतं तस्यान्तः पुरमाबभौ।
शारदस्याभिरामस्य चन्द्रस्येव नभोऽशुभिः।। ?

4. चारु तद्वदनं तस्यास्ताम्रशुक्लायतेक्षणम्।
अशोभत विशालाक्ष्या राहुमुक्त इवोडुराट्।। *Ibid.*, V. 35-85.

5. व्यदीपयंश्चारु विवेश पार्थिवः
शशीव तारागणसंकुलं नभः। *Ibid.*, II. 5-26.

of Sītā and his flight to Lankā with her[1]. Again, Menakā bathing in the blue waters of the *puṣkara* lake looked like lighting in the cloud[2]. The same image can come wherever there is a combination of bright and dark things. Rāvaṇa sitting in his shining chariot also looks like lightning in a cloud[3]. Hanumān decked with flowers also appears to be a cloud with flashes of lightning[4].

Fire plays more or less the same role as the Sun and the Moon, except that its burning and destructive character often comes out in the images. To it also is compared anything that is brilliant and shining, whether it be an animate or an inanimate object. Sītā is like the flame of a burning fire[4]. So is Ahalyā[5]. Soldiers[6], ascetics[7], Gandharvas[8], plants[9], birds[10], blood[11]- these are some of the things which are compared to fire, either for their lustre and brilliance, or their destructive power. The consuming nature of grief or sorrow marks it out for comparison

---

1. सा पद्मपीता हेमाभा रावणं जनकात्मजा।
विद्युद्धनमिवाविश्य शुशुभे तप्तभूषणा।। *Ibid.*, III. 52-24.
2. तां ददर्श महातेजा मेनकां कुशिकात्मजः।
रूपेणाप्रतिमां तत्र (पुष्करेषु) विद्युतं जलदे यथा।। *Ibid.*, I. 1-63-5.
3. कामगं रथमास्थाय शुशुभे राक्षसाधिपः।
विद्युन्मण्डलवान् मेघः सबालक इवाम्बरे। *Ibid.*, III. 35-10.
4. बभौ मेघ इवोद्यन् वै विद्युद्गणविभूषितः। *Ibid.*, V. 1-52.
5. दीप्तस्येव हुताशस्य शिखा सीता सुमध्यमा। *Ibid.*, III. 37-20.
6. धूमेनाभिपरीताङ्गीं दीप्तामग्निशिखामिव। *Ibid.*, I. 49-14.
7. योधानामग्निकल्पानाम्। *Ibid.*, I. 6-21.
8. अभिवाद्य मुनिश्रेष्ठं ज्वलन्तमिव पावकम्। *Ibid.*, I. 31-3.
9. कोटयस्तत्र चतुर्विंशद्गन्धर्वाणां तपस्विनाम्।
वसन्त्यग्निनिकाशानां घोराणां पापकर्मणाम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 42-21, 22.
10. निशि भान्त्यचलेन्द्रस्य हुताशनशिखा इव।
ओषध्यः स्वप्रभालक्ष्या भ्राजमानाः सहस्रशः।। *Ibid.*, II. 94-21.
11. निपेतुः शोणितादिग्धा धरण्यां पावकोपमाः। *Ibid.*, III. 3-12.

with fire[1] and it is also to fire hidden by ashes that genius or valour in men hidden by their modesty is compared[2].

III

We saw in the preceding section that when Vālmikī has to describe the greatness, dignity and lustre of kings and other great personages, he compares them to the Sun and Moon. But many are the occasions when 'greatness' in the mere physical sense, or 'magnitude' also calls for description. Here, mountains and clouds almost seem to hold the monopoly for acting as standards of comparison. The first object which seems to occur to the poet when he wants to find an analogy for something which is just 'big' is a mountain, a perfectly intelligible comparison and one that is likely to occur to human beings all over the world. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, Vālin and Śugrīva, Rāvaṇa and Kumbhakarṇa, Hanumān and Jaṭāyus, Atikāya and Triśiras— these are some among the many characters of the work who are likened to a mountain.[3] Usually the comparison is of a very simple nature, in which we are just told that somebody big is like a mountain. Sometimes, however, we get details. Vālin is struck by Sugrīva with a Sāla tree as a mountain is struck by

1. मुखं ते प्रेक्ष्य मां शोको दहत्यग्निरिवाश्रयम्।
भृशं मनसि वैदेहि व्यसनारणिसंभवः।। *Ibid.*, II. 104-26.

2. सूचयन्ति परं तेजो भस्मच्छन्नमिवानलम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 11-81.

3. तौ हन्यमानौ नाराचैर्धाराभिरिव पर्वतौ। *Ibid.*, VI. 80-29.
इषुणाभिहतं दृष्टवा बालिनं कुञ्जरोपमम्।
वानरं पर्वतेन्द्राभम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 20-3.
सुभुजं शुक्लदशनं महास्यं पर्वतोपमम् (रावणम्)। *Ibid.*, III. 32-9.
तं दृष्टवा राक्षसश्रेष्ठं पर्वताकारदर्शनम् (कुम्भकर्णम्)। *Ibid.*, VI. 61-2.
ततो हनूमान् गिरिसन्निकाशः
कृताञ्जलिस्तामभिवाद्य वृद्धाम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 50-40.
ततः पर्वतशृङ्गाभस्तीक्ष्णतुण्डः खगोत्तमः। *Ibid.*, III. 50-2.
(अतिकायः) शृङ्गाभ्यामिव तुङ्गाभ्यां हिमवान् पर्वतोपमः। *Ibid.*, VI. 71-23.
अभ्यद्रवद्रणे रामं (त्रिशिराः) त्रिशृङ्ग इव पर्वतः। *Ibid.*, III. 27.7.

'*vajra*' Lakṣmaṇa, with three arrows striking out of his forehead, looked like a mountain with three peaks[1]. It is not only living beings who are compared to mountains for their size; a host of other things are so compared. Thus, houses and palaces are usually likened to peaks of mountains, either for their size or for the closely connected conception of height. The palaces of all kings, no matter whether they are men, monkeys or merely, Rākṣasas, are equally honoured in this manner[2]. That elephants, of all animals, should be compared to mountains is not likely to cause surprise in anybody[3]. Equally natural is the comparison of clouds with mountains[4]. In fact the connection between mountains and clouds is so close that they seem almost interchangeable in most of the images of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. About this, however, more will be said later. Waves in the sea are also likened to mountains[5], which is also quite intelligible. When the poet says that the trees, with smoke clinging to their tops, look like "*Vaidūrya*" hills covered with clouds[6], we must recognize

1. गात्रेष्वभिहतो वाली वज्रेणेव महागिरिः। *Ibid.*, IV. 16-23.
तैः पृषत्कैर्ललाटस्थैः शुशुभे रघुनन्दनः।
रणाग्रे समरश्लाघी त्रिशृंग इव पर्वतः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 91-34.

2. स तु वेश्म पुनर्मातुः कैलासशिखरप्रभम्। *Ibid.*, II. 39-27.
गृहैश्च गिरिसंकाशैः शारदाम्बुदसन्निभैः। *Ibid.*, V. 2.16.
विन्ध्यमेरुगिरिप्रख्यैः प्रासादैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 33.8.
शुक्लैः प्रासादशिखरैः कैलासशिखरोपमैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 33.15.
मेरुशृङ्गसमं सूतो राजवेश्म ददर्श ह। *Ibid.*, II. 15.37.

3. वारणैरवमृद्यन्ते मामकैः पर्वतोपमैः। *Ibid.*, II. 99.3
गजैः पर्वतकूटाभैः। *Ibid.*, III. 25.10.
नागाश्च गिरिसन्निभाः। *Ibid.*, II. 16.34.
गजा मदोत्कटाः शूराश्चलन्त इव पर्वताः।

4. संपश्य त्वं नभो मेघैः संवृतं गिरिसन्निभैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 28.2.

5. मेरुमंदरसंकाशान् उद्वतान् सुमहार्णवे।
अत्यक्रामन् महावेगांस्तरङ्गान् गणयन्निव।। *Ibid.*, V. 1.70.

6. एते वृक्षाः प्रकाशन्ते धूमसंसक्तमस्तकाः।
मेघजालप्रतिच्छन्ना वैदूर्यगिरयो यथा।। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.24.

that something more than mere size is the basis of comparison. There is also the green colour of the tree which has called forth the analogy with the tree. When the *'parigha'* or the 'club' is compared to a mountain-peak[1], perhaps mere magnitude is the basis of the comparison. The same is the case where heaps of food are likened to mountains[2].

While elephants are compared to mountains on account of their huge size, they themselves can become standards of comparison in the matter of magnitude[3]. In all these images, figuring mountains, the ranges and peaks usually mentioned are Kailāsa, Meru, Mandara, Vindhya and Himālaya.

As was pointed out above, clouds play a part in Sanskrit imagery very similar to that of mountain[4], except that the poet seems to be conscious not only of their size, but also of their colour, dark or white according to the season of the year. That is why it is chiefly monkeys and Rākṣasas, in whom size and colour are equally remarkable, who are usually compared to clouds. Usually the comparison is a very simple one, but sometimes it becomes more picturesque. Vālin, with his garland round his

1. जग्राह गिरिशृङ्गाभं परिधं लोमहर्षणम्। *Ibid.*, III. 26-10.
2. अन्नकूटाश्च दृश्यन्ते बहवः पर्वतोपमाः। *Ibid.*, I. 14-15.
3. वानरान् द्विरदप्रख्यान्। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.11
   वालिनं कुञ्जरोपमम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 20.2.
4. अञ्जनाम्बुदसंकाशाः कुञ्जरेन्द्रमहौजसः।
   अञ्जने पर्वते चैव ये वसन्ति प्लवंगमाः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 37.5.
   सपर्वतवनाकाशां दक्षिणां हरिवाहिनी।
   छादयन्ती ययौ भीमा द्यामिवाम्बुदसंततिः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 4.58.
   ते (राक्षसाः) वलाहकसंकाशा महाकाया महाबलाः। *Ibid.*, III. 25.9.
   इति प्रतिसमादिष्टा राक्षसास्ते चतुर्दश।
   तत्र जग्मुस्तया सार्धं घना वातेरिता यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 19.26.
   ततो नीलाम्बुदप्रख्यः प्रहस्तो नाम राक्षसः। *Ibid.*, VI. 8.1.
   नीलजीमूतसंकाशस्तप्तप्रकाञ्चनकुण्डलः। *Ibid.*, III. 38.2.

neck looks like a cloud tinged by the red glow of the evening[1]. Sugrīva with his garland looks like the evening cloud with its string of *balāka* birds[2]. Rāvaṇa smeared with sandal paste, looks like a cloud with lightning[3]. In all this, not merely the size and colour of the cloud, but the colour of the garlands or sandal paste also suggests the image. Many are the passages where houses and palaces are likened to clouds, but here it is the white autumn clouds which are usually mentioned, they being more appropriate for tall white-washed buildings, having many stories[4]. Among other objects compared to clouds are forest ranges[5], or groves of trees, which can produce the illusion of clouds, especially when they are at a distance, a line of smoke[6], from its very obvious resembalance to a mass of clouds, elephants[7] and finally, mountains themselves[8]. The identification of cloud and mountain is deep-rooted and universal among human beings, as the study of Indo-Europeon language shows.

---

1. स (वाली) तया मालया वीरो हैमया हरियूथपः।
सन्ध्यानुगतपर्यन्तः पयोधर इवाभवत्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.6.

2. स तया शुशुभे श्रीमांल्लतया कण्ठ सक्तया।
मालयेव बलाकानां ससन्ध्य इव तोयदः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 12.41.

3. लोहितेतानुलिसाङ्गं चन्दनेन सुगन्धिना।
सन्ध्यारक्तमिवाकाशं तोयदं सतडिद्रणम्।। *Ibid.*, V. 10.8.

4. स गृहैरभ्रसंकाशैः पाण्डुरैरुपशोभितम्। *Ibid.*, II. 17.2.
सिताभ्रशिखरप्रख्यं प्रासादमधिरुह्य च। *Ibid.*, II. 5.22.
सिताभ्रशिखराभ्रेषु देवतायतनेषु च। *Ibid.*, II. 6.11.

5. एतत्प्रकाशते दूरान्नीलमेघनिभं वनम्। *Ibid.*, II. 93.8.
वनं महामेघनिभं प्रविष्टो द्रुमैर्महद्भिर्विविधैरुपेतम्। *Ibid.*, III. 3.26.
एष मेघ इवाकाशे वृक्षषण्डः प्रकाशते। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.14.

6. एतञ्च वनमध्यस्थं कृष्णाभ्रशिखरोपमम्।
पावकस्याश्रमस्थस्य धूमाग्रं संप्रदृश्यते। *Ibid.*, III. 11.51.

7. वारणैश्च चतुर्दन्तैः श्वेताभ्रनिचयोपमैः। *Ibid.*, V. 4.28.

8. पर्वतांश्चाभ्रसन्निभान्। *Ibid.*, III. 11.45.

Whether the standard of comparison be the Sun or the Moon, Mountain or cloud, it seems to describe only the general aspect of a person or thing. There are, however, the details to be considered, especially in the case of persons. The work abounds, in images descriptive of the different parts of the body of men, monkeys and demons. The following table will show at a glance the objects to which the different parts of the body are compared.

Object compared	***Standard of comparison***
Colour of person-	blue lotus, cloud, *Vaidūrya, anjaña* (dark persons); molten gold[1].
Face	Moon, lotus, sun, coral[2].
Eyes	Lotus, fire, copper, *alāta*, blood, deer's eyes, Sun[3].

---

1. इन्दीवरश्यामः। *Ibid.*, II. 89.19;
मेघश्यामं महाबाहुम् (रामम्)। *Ibid.* II. 83.8;
स्निग्धवैदूर्यसंकाशः (रावणः)। *Ibid.* III. 35.8;
भिन्नाञ्जनचयश्यामः। *Ibid.* VI. 45.14;
तप्तकाञ्चनवर्णाभा। *Ibid.* III. 34.17;
सुग्रीवो हेमपिङ्गलः। *Ibid.* IV. 14.9.

2. राकाशशिनिभाननः। *Ibid.* III. 31.16;
सदृशं शारदस्येन्दोः फुल्लस्य कमलस्य च। *Ibid.* II. 64.70;
विद्रुमप्रतिमाननः (हनुमान्)। *Ibid.* V. 33.2.

3. कमलपत्राक्षीम् (कैकेयीम्)। *Ibid.* II. 10.27;
कमलपत्राक्षः (रामः)। *Ibid.* II. 13.9;
चक्षुषानलकल्पेन। *Ibid.* III. 11.66;
विनिःश्वस्य स ताम्राक्षः क्रुद्धो नाग इव श्वसन्। *Ibid.* II. 92.28;
अलातसदृशेक्षणा। *Ibid.* III. 18.17;
क्षतजसमे नयने। *Ibid.* IV. 35.23;
क्षतजोपमाक्षः। *Ibid.* IV. 24.31;
मृगशावाक्षीम्। *Ibid.* III. 18.17;
नवार्कोदिततामचक्षुः *Ibid.* VI. 59.17.

Tresses	Black cobra, line of forests[1].
Lips	Copper[2].
Neck	Colour of sandal[3].
Shoulders	Bull's, lion's[4].
Breasts	Ripe *Tāla* fruits, *Bilva* fruits[5].
Arms	Blot, elephant's trunk, Indra's banner[6].
Hands	Five-headed snakes, Indra's banner, lotus[7].
Thighs	Elephant's trunk, plantain tree[8].
Voice	Cloud, *Dundubhi*, *Kalahanisa*[9].
Gaze	Lion
Tears	Crystal[10]

1. नीलनागाभया वेण्या। *Ibid.*, V. 14.25;
नीलया नीरदापाये वनराज्या महीमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 14.25.
2. चारुताम्रोष्ठम्। *Ibid.*, III. 52.21.
3. चन्दनवर्णाभा ग्रीवा (सीतायाः)। *Ibid.*, III. 60.32.
4. सिंहवृषस्कन्धः। *Ibid.*, IV. 53.7.
5. पक्वतालोपमस्तनी। *Ibid.*, III. 60.18;
बिल्वोपमस्तनी। *Ibid.*, III. 60.13.
6. परिघायतबाहवः। *Ibid.*, III. 5.16;
वृत्तौ करिकरोपमौ। *Ibid.*, V. 13.18;
भुजाविन्द्रध्वजोपमौ। *Ibid.*, V. 10.15.
7. पञ्चशीर्षोपरिवोरगैः। *Ibid.*, V. 50.8.
8. ऊरून् करिकरोपमान्। *Ibid.*, III. 25.22;
कदलीकाण्डसदृशौ। *Ibid.*, III. 62.4.
9. ननाद विविधान् नादान् यथा प्रावृषि तोयदः। *Ibid.*, III. 18.23;
दुन्दुभिस्वनम्। *Ibid.*, I. 16.12;
सबाष्पकलया वाचा कलहंसस्वरो युवा। *Ibid.*, I. 82.10.
10. तस्याः स्फटिकसंकाशं वारि संतापसंभवम्। *Ibid.*, II. 30.24.

Gait	Proud tiger's, Intoxicated elephant's, Bull's[1].

All this relates only to the description of the purely external aspect of persons and things, without any reference to their feelings or their relation to one another. Such description is not, however,the chief interest of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which abounds, as was said before, in pictures of men and women, under the stress of deep feelings or in their relation to one another. The work is, after all, a narrative of the actions of men and women. We have so far seen what kind of images are used by Vā lmīki in his description of kings and princes in all their royal dignity and splendour. We have also seen that the same images recur also in the description of other things at their best. But persons and things do not always remain at their best. In a state of distress, they lose their former lustre and glory. Let us see what images are used by the poet in describing things in this state. It is only natural that in a story in which the fortunes of men and things change so frequently according to circumstances, there should be descriptions of them in their fallen state also. Indeed one is struck by the extraordinary variety of the things to which men and things in such a state are compared. Nor are these images scattered throughout the work. Sometimes, as in the description of Sītā in distress, a large number of them occur in the same passage, lending extraordinary force to the emotion which is meant to be conveyed. Such images are grouped together in the following paragraph for the reader's convenience. Such images are mostly found in the description of Sītā in her sorrow, either before or after her ravishment by Rāvaṇa. In such a state, we

---

1. दृप्तशार्दूलविक्रमम् । *Ibid.*, I. 16.12;
सिंहविक्रान्तगामिनम् । *Ibid.*, II. 92.21;
वृषभश्रेष्ठविक्रमौ । *Ibid.*, IV. 3.10.

are told she looked like the Sun in eclipse[1], or without its lustre, or the Moon in day-time[2], or moonlight covered by clouds[3], or a fallen star[4], or a lotus-stalk soiled by mud[5], or a lotus-bed squashed[6], or a lotus without its stalk[7], or a lotus fading in the Sun[8], or a creeper without flower[9], or the fallen branch of a tree[10], or a deer gone astray[11], or deer followed by dogs[12], or a Śārikā in a cage[13], or a female elephant separated from its mate[14], or a *Cakravākī* without its mate[15], or gold covered by dust[16], or a boat in the middle of the ocean, buffeted by the winds[17], or the altar soiled[18], or an army with dead heroes[19], or Hope baffled[20], or Prosperity vanished[21], or Faith

---

1. अनन्या राघवेणाहं भास्करेण यथा प्रभा। *Ibid.*, V. 21.15.
2. शुशुभे न विना रामं दिवा चन्द्र इवोदितः। *Ibid.*, III. 51.22.
3. प्रभां नक्षत्रराजस्य कालमेघैरिवावृताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 15.37.
4. क्षीणपुण्यां च्युतां भूमौ तारां निपतितामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.20.
5-6. मृणाली पङ्कदिग्धेव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.25;
पदिमनीमिव विध्वस्ताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.13.
7. न रराज विना रामं विनालमिव पङ्कजम्। *Ibid.*, III. 52.18.
8-9. पद्ममातपसंतप्तम्। *Ibid.*, II. 104.25;
लतामकुसुमामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.25.
10. छिन्नां प्रपतितां भूमौ शाखामिव वनस्पतेः। *Ibid.*, V. 19.5.
11. वने यूथपरिभ्रष्टा मृगी कोकैरिवार्दिता। *Ibid.*, V. 25.5.
12. मृगयूथपरिभ्रष्टां मृगीं श्वभिरिवावृताम्। *Ibid.*, III. 55.5.
13. पञ्जरस्थेव शारिका। *Ibid.*, V. 13.13;
यूथपेन विना कृताम्।
14. निःश्वसन्तीं सुदुःखार्तां गजराजवधूमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.18.
15. सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी। *Ibid.*, V. 16.30.
16. काञ्चनं रजसा ध्वस्तम्। *Ibid.*, II. 104.25.
17. वायुवेगैरिवाक्रान्तां मज्जन्तीं नावमर्णवे। *Ibid.*, III. 55.4.
18. वेदीमिव परामृष्टाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.14.
19. हतवीरां चमूमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.13.
20. आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 15.33;
21. ऋद्धिं निपतितामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 15.33.

destroyed[1], or an Order disobeyed[2], or the Future imperilled[3], or Wisdom in decay[4], or *Smṛti* in doubt[5], or learning acquired on *Pratipad*[6]. Similarly, Ayodhyā without Rāma and Daśaratha, is like the sky without the Sun[7], or the Moon or the stars[8], or like the sky covered by clouds[9], or the night without the Moon[10], or the ocean without water[11], or a river with little water[12], or like a sinking wave of the ocean[13], or a tank without flowers, or a cow deserted by the bull[15], or a cave without its lion, or a deserted tavern[16], or a string of pearls without any precious stone in it[17], or a creeper fading under the fire[18]. Daśaratha in deep sorrow is like a *Ṛṣī* who had lied[19], or fallen Yayāti, or a tank without water[24], or a snake without its power[20].

1-2. श्रद्धामिव विमानिताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.11.
आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.12.

3-4. आयतीमिव विध्वस्ताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.12.
प्रशामिव परिक्षीणाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.11.

5-6. तां स्मृतीमिव संदिग्धाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 15.34.
प्रतिपत्पाठशीलस्य विद्येव तनुतां गता। *Ibid.*, V. 59.32.

7. गतप्रभा द्यौरिव भास्करं विना। *Ibid.*, II. 66.28.

8. चन्द्रहीनमिवाकाशम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.18;
नष्टतारमिवाम्बरम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.35.

9. प्रच्छन्नशशिनक्षत्रां द्यामिवाम्बुधरैर्युताम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.13.

10. निष्प्रभा त्वयि निष्क्रान्ते गतचन्द्रेव शर्वरी। *Ibid.*, II. 53.29.

11-12. तोयहीनमिवार्णवम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.18;
अल्पोष्णक्षुब्धसलिलाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.4.

13. प्रशान्तमारुतोद्धूतां जलोर्मिमिव निःस्वनाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.7.

14. गोवृषेण परित्यक्तां गवां पत्नीमिवोत्सुकाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.9.

15. हतशौण्डामिव ध्वस्तां पानभूमिमसंस्कृताम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.4.

16. वियुक्तां मणिभिर्जात्यैर्नवां मुक्तावलीमिव। *Ibid.*, II. 114.10.

17. द्रुतदावाग्निविप्लुष्टां क्लान्तां वनलतामिव। *Ibid.*, II. 114.12.

18. उक्तानृतमृषिं यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 18.6;

19. तटाकमिव निस्तोयम्। *Ibid.*, II. 34.3.

20. हततेजा यथा सर्पो बभूव जगतीपतिः। *Ibid.*, II. 12.54.

Kaikeyī fallen on the floor in deep sorrow looked like creeper that has been cut, or a fallen goddess, or a fallen Kinnarī, or a fallen Apsaras, or *Māyā* gone astray, or a deer imprisoned, or a female elephant wounded by a hunter[1]. Prostrate Rāma is like fire without lustre, or the setting Sun, or the Moon in eclipse[2]. When wounded and covered with flood, he is like the sun surrounded by the evening clouds. Defeated Viśvāmitra looked like the ocean without its velocity, or a serpent with broken fangs, or the sun in eclipse or a bird without wings[3]. A kingdom without a king is like a river without water, forest without grass, cows without a keeper[4]. A kingdom devoid of its wealth is like wine without fermentation. A kingdom enjoyed by another is like wine robbed of its essence, a sacrifice without Soma[5]. An army without generals is like a boat without oars. When it is in a state of depression, it is like a ship on the sea when there is no wind[6].

1. लतामिव विनिष्कृत्तां पतितां देवतामिव।
किन्नरीमिव निर्धूतां च्युतामप्सरसं यथा।
मायामिव परिभ्रष्टां हरिणीमिव संयताम्।
करेणुमिव दिग्धेन विद्धां मृगयुना वने। *Ibid.*, II. 10.24-26.

2. विलापोपरतं रामं गतार्चिषमिवानलम्। *Ibid.*, II. 53.28.
भास्करोऽस्तमिव व्रजन्। *Ibid.*, 6. 49.15.
परिपूर्णः शशी काले ग्रहेणोपप्लुतो यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 40.30.
स विद्धः क्षतजैर्दिग्धः सर्वगात्रेषु राघवः।
बभूव रामः सन्ध्याभ्रैर्दिवाकर इवावृतः।। *Ibid.*, III. 25.15.

3. समुद्र इव निर्वेगो भग्नदंष्ट्र इवोरगः।
उपरक्त इवादित्यः सद्यो निष्प्रभतां गतः।।
लूनपक्ष इव द्विजः। *Ibid.*, I. 55.9.

4. यथा ह्यनुदका नद्यो यथा वाप्यतृणं वनम्।
अंगोपाला यथा गावस्तया राष्ट्रमराजकम्।। *Ibid.*, II. 67.29.

5. राज्यं गतधनं साधो पीतमण्डां सुरामिव। *Ibid.*, II. 36.12;
तथा ह्यात्तमिदं राज्यं हृतसारां सुरामिव।
नाभिमन्तुमलं रामो नष्टसोममिवाध्वरम्।। *Ibid.*, II. 61.18.

6. सेवा भ्रमति संख्येषु हतकर्णेव नौर्जले। *Ibid.*, VI. 48.26.
किमिव व्यथिता सेना मूढवातेव नौर्जले। *Ibid.*, VI. 50.1.

Vālin, lying on the floor after having been struck by Rāma looked like the sky without the Moon, or the Sun fallen on the earth at the end of a *Yuga* or Yayāti fallen on earth[1]. When struck by Sugrīva with a Sāa tree, he looked like an over crowded boat on the ocean[2]. Bharata, lying on the floor in sorrow, on hearing of Rāma's exile, looked like the sun at the end of a *Yuga*[3]. He and Śatrughna, prostrate, seemed to be two bulls with broken horns[4].

On examining the above lists, one finds that the same images are sometimes used to characterize more than one thing in a fallen state, while others occur in the case of particular persons and things only. Thus, Sītā, Ayodhyā and Kausalyā, all look like a fallen star, in a state of lost glory. Sītā, without Rāma, and Ayodhyā without Rāma are both like an army with dead heroes. From this, can we draw the conclusion that all these images are interchangeable ? Can we imagine Vāmīki saying that Sītā in distress is like a lake devoid of its snakes ? This is said, in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in connection with the palace without Rāma[5]. It is found in the *Mahābhārata* also, where it is used to describe Duryodhana's tent[7] ? A palace and a tent are both places of residence and one can, therefore, understand why the image occurs in both cases. We are, perhaps, justified in declaring that Vālmīki would not have used the comparison in describing Sītā.

---

1. नष्टचन्द्रमिव व्योम। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.3;
   आदित्यमिव कालेन युगान्ते भुवि पातितम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.10;
   ययातिमिव पुण्यान्ते देवलोकादिह च्युतम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.9.
2. गुरुभारसमाक्रान्ता नौः ससार्थेव सागरे। *Ibid.*, IV. 16.24.
3. ददर्श रामो दुर्दर्शे युगान्ते भास्करं यथा।
4. धरायां स्म व्यचेष्टेतां भग्नशृङ्गाविवर्षभौ। *Ibid.*, II. 78.20.
5. महाह्रदमिवाक्षोभ्यं सुपर्णेन ह्रतोरगम्। *Ibid.*, II. 42.25.
6. गतोत्सवं पुरमिव हतनागमिव ह्रदम्। M. Bh. IX. 63.5.

Mention has already been made in the preceding part of the occurrence of some of these images in the *Mahābhārata*. A few more might be mentioned here to indicate the similarity in spirit of the two epics. Damayantī in distress is like a lotus-bed spoiled, or a lotus stalk pulled out, or a louts-bed smeared with mud or the full-moon night with the moon in eclipse, or the moon covered by black clouds, or the sun surrounded by smoke, or a dried up river[1]. Kārṇa's face in like a lotus spoilt by rain water, or fallen on the ground[2]. The army of the Kurus without Bhīṣma is like the sky without stars, or the sky without wind[3]. The Kāmyaka wood is like an empty wine jar, or a lake without snakes[4].

The above images culled from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* incidentally tell us what were the attributes which in the popular imagination, were always associated with certain things whose absence took away all glory and lustre from them. This invariable association is explicitly mentioned by the poet in some places. Sītā says, she would not deviate from *Dharma*, anymore than light can be separated from the moon[5]. Rāma

---

1. व्याकुलामिव पदिमनीम्। *M. Bh.* III. 65.20.
   मृणालीमिव चोद्धृतम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.21.
   मलपङ्कानुलिप्ताङ्गीं प्रम्लानां नलिनीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 65.18.
   पौर्णमासीमिव निशां राहुग्रस्तनिशाकराम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.19.
   चन्द्रलेखामिव नवां व्योम्नि नीलाभ्रसंवृताम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.22.
   निबद्धां धूमजालेन प्रभामिव विभावसोः। *Ibid.*, III. 65.13.
   कृशस्रोतां नदीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 65.19.
2. बभौ वर्षाम्बुविक्लिलं पदमागलितं यथा। *Ibid.*, I. 146.35.
3. द्यौरिवापेतनक्षत्रा हीनं स्वमिव वायुना। *Ibid.*, VII. 1.26.
4. सरः सुपर्णेन हृतोरगेन्द्रमराजकं राष्ट्रमिहेव शान्तम्।
   एवंविधं मे प्रतिभाति काम्यकं शौण्डैर्यथा पीतसुरश्च कुम्भः।।
   Ibid., III. 270.5.
5. धर्माद्विचलितुं नाहमलं चन्द्रादिव प्रभा। *Rāmā* II. 39.28.

does not give up his cheerfulness as the autumn moon its lustre. He does not disregard his fathers' order as the moon does not abandon its lustre[1]. Sugrīva helping Rāma is as natural as that the moon should shed its lustre, or that the sun should make the sky bright or that Indra should give rain[2]. The indissoluble association of husband and wife is like that of *Vīṇā* and string, chariot and wheel[3].

Closely allied to the description of how men and things looked in a state of faded lustre and greatness are pictures of what they do in sorrow. As shedding tears is the most common action of men and women in sorrow, it is often described. Kausalyā sheds tears as a canal brings fresh water[4], tears from Sītā's eyes took like drops of water from a lotus[5]. Sugrīva held in check a flood of tears which came to him like a flood in a river[6]. Rāma was choked with tears as the moon with snow[7]. Tears of joy also sometimes enter into images as when we are told that Kausalyā will shed tears of joy as a line of clouds showers water[8]. In sorrow, people not only weep, they also sometime collapse. Daśaratha, Rāma and many others fall on the floor

---

1. नाजहात् पितुरादेशं शशी ज्योत्स्नामिवोदितः। *Ibid.*, II. 82.6.
2. यदिन्द्रो वर्षते वर्षे न तत्त्चित्रं भविष्यति।
   आदित्योऽसौ सहस्रांशुः कुर्याद्वितिमिरं नभः।।
   चन्द्रमा रजनीं कुर्यात् प्रभया सौम्यनिर्मलाम्।
   त्वद्विधो वापि मित्राणां प्रीतिं कुर्यात् परंतप।। *Ibid.*, IV. 39.2-4.
3. नातन्त्री विद्यते वीणा नाचक्रो विद्यते रथः। *Ibid.*, II. 39.28.
4. कौसल्या व्यसृजद्बाष्पं प्रणालीव नवोदकम्। *Ibid.*, II. 62.10.
5. पुण्डरीकलताशाभ्यां धिप्रकीर्णमिवोदकम्। *Ibid.*, V. 33.4.
6. वाष्पवेगं तु सहसा नदीवेगमिवागतम्।
   धारयामास धैर्येण सुग्रीवो रामसन्निधौ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 8.30.
7. अभवद्बाष्पसंरुद्धो नीहारेणेव चन्द्रमाः। *Ibid.*, IV. 6.6.
8. मुदाश्रु मोक्ष्यसे क्षिप्रं मेघरेखेव वार्षिकी। *Ibid.*, II. 44.27.
   निकृतमिव सालस्य स्कन्धं परशुना वने। *Ibid.*, II. 72.22.

in their sorrow and the normal analogy is that of a tree that has been cut down[1]. Of Śūrpaṇakhā, we are told that she fell like a thunder-bolt from the sky[2]. In great sorrow, the heart breaks like the banks of a great river flooded in the rainy season[3]. To the wriggling motion of a snake on the ground is compared the wallowing on the ground of one in extreme agony[4].

The Rāmāyaṇa contains more than mere exhibitions of sorrow. Battles occupy quite a large portion of the work with all their implications of courage and fear, anger and calm; fights take place in all *Kāṇḍās*, except perhaps in the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, while the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* is full of them. Courage is the basis of all fights and those who possess it are compared usually to Indra and Viṣṇu[5], who are famous for their *vīrya*, in the Vedas. More unusual and therefore, interesting are comparisons with Yama and Vāyu for *vīrya*'[6]. If Indra and Viṣṇu are the models of courage, it is the deer which stands for fear. The followers of Khara run away like the deer terrified by the hunters[7]. It is not merely cowards in battle who are compared to terror-stricken deer. When Sītā sees the cloth made of bark which she has to wear before going to the forest, she becomes terrified like a deer when it sees the net which is meant to catch it[8]. If the deer is the type of the victim of fear, it is the snake which represents the cause of fear. People fear a liar as they

1. निपपातैष दुःखेन कृत्तमूल इव द्रुमः। *Ibid.*, II. 40.36.
2. पपात भूमौ गगनाद् यथाशनिः। *Ibid.*, III. 18.25.
3. प्रावृषीव महानद्या स्पृष्टकूलं नवाम्भता *Ibid.*, II. 21.49.
   अयमात्मभवः शोको मामनाथामचेतसम्।
   संसाधयति वेगेन यथाकूलं नदीरयः।। *Ibid.*, II. 64.74-75.
4. हा नाथेति विनर्दन्ती सर्पवज्वेष्टसे क्षितौ। *Ibid.*, III. 21.4.
5. यमशक्रमसो वीर्ये बृहस्पतिसमो मतौ। *Ibid.*, II. 1.39;
   अहो वीर्यमहो दाढर्ये विष्णोरिव हि दृश्यते। *Ibid.*, III. 30.32.
6. पवनसमानविक्रमाः प्लवगवराः। *Ibid.*, IV. 63.15.
7. द्रवन्ति स्म न तिष्ठन्ति व्याघ्रत्रस्ता मृगा इव। *Ibid.*, III. 27.20.
8. संप्रेक्ष्य वीरं संत्रस्ता पृषती वागुरामिव। *Ibid.*, III. 37.9.

do a snake[1]. Rāma became terrified on seeing Daśaratha in distress as one does on touching a snake with the feet[2].

Coming back to matters relating to war, an army is compared to an ocean when its size and density are to be emphasized and to masses of clouds when its massive, noisy character is to be brought out[3]. Or such an army, bows and arrows are the chief weapons. The usual comparison of an arrow is with a snake, probably because of its long shape, its quick motion accompanied by its hissing sound and finally its fatal character[4]. In one passage, the common points mentioned are the sharp points and the joints *(ṛjuparvaṇaḥ)*. Sometimes the comparison is with a thunderbolt, or fire, or lightning, or noose of death, or the Sun[5]. The spear is like Indra's banner, or the thunderbolt[6]. Daggers are like serpents[7]. Slaps and blows with

---

1. उद्विजन्ते यथा सर्पान्नरादनृतवादिनः। *Ibid.*, II. 109.12.
2. रामोऽपि भयमापन्नः पदात् स्पष्ट्वे पन्नगम्। *Ibid.*, II. 18.4.
3. महतीयमितः सेवा सागराभा प्रदृश्यते। *Ibid.*, II. 84.2;
   सागरौघनिभा सेना भरतस्य महात्मनः। *Ibid.*, II. 93.4;
   धृतनानाप्रहरणं गम्भीरं सागरोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 24.32;
   सागरौघनिभं भीमं तद्वानरबलं महत्। *Ibid.*, VI. 4.39;
   प्रावृट्काले यथा मेघा नर्दमानाः सविद्युतः। *Ibid.*, VI. 53.12;
   महीं संच्छादयामास प्रावृषि द्यामिवाम्बुदः। *Ibid.*, II. 93.4;
   जीमूता इव घर्मान्ते सघोषाः संप्रतिस्थिरे। *Ibid.*, II. 92.34.
4. शरानाशीविषोपमान्। *Ibid.*, III. 27.13;
   क्रुद्धानाशीविषानिव। *Ibid.*, III. 28.4;
   दीप्तान् क्षिपति नाराचान् सर्पानिव महाविषान् *Ibid.*, III. 34.7;
   जीवितान्तकरैर्घोरैर्ज्वलद्भिरिव पन्नगैः।
   तीक्ष्णाग्रऋजुपर्वाणः सरोषा भुजगा इव।। *Ibid.*, IV. 5.28.
5. विधूमा इव पावकाः। *Ibid.*, III. 26.30;
   चापस्य रूपं विद्युद्रणोपमम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.74;
   कालपाशोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 25.17;
   नाराचान् सूर्यसन्निभान्। *Ibid.*, III. 20.18.
6. स विनद्य महानादं शूलं शक्रध्वजोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 3.14.
7. खड्गावेते विराजेते निर्मुक्तभुजगाविव। *Ibid.*, IV. 3.19.

fists are like thunderbolts[1]. When the fighters fall in battle, they fall usually like trees cut down or struck by lightning or like Indra's banner or like a mountain struck by thunderbolt[2]. Śūrpaṇakhā rushes at Rāma as Rāhu at the Moon[3]. When one rushes at another only to be destroyed, it is like a moth rushing at fire[4]. Two mighty soldiers fighting with each other is like the clash of clouds, or like the meeting of a lion and an elephant, or like the battle between Vṛtra and Vāsava, or between Budha and Angāraka[5]. It is clear from all this that the imagery of war, as all other imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is mainly derived from nature and mythology.

IV

We may now turn from war and battle to things more homely. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is justly famous for descriptions of the tender side of life, love, loyalty and devotion. In the midst of elaborate description of fights are to be found many scenes drawn from family life. The main theme of the work is, after all, the dutifulness of Rāma as a son and the devotion and loyalty of Sitā as a wife. These are not, however, the only human emotions

---

1. तप्तैरशनिकल्पैश्च। *Ibid.*, IV. 12.18;
वज्रकल्पैश्च मुष्टिभिः। *Ibid.*, IV. 12.18.
2. पपात सहसा भूमौ छिन्नमूल इव द्रुमः। *Ibid.*, VI. 58.54;
पपात वज्राभिहतो यथाद्रिः। *Ibid.*, VI. 70.28;
अपतद्देवराजस्य मुक्तरश्मिरिव ध्वजः। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.2.
3. अभ्यगच्छत् सुसंक्रुद्धा महोल्का रोहिणीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 18.17;
राममेवाभिदुद्राव राहुश्चन्द्रमसं यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 27.20.
4. आससादाथ ते रामं पतंग इव पावकम्। *Ibid.*, V. 42.27.
5. बभूव वातोद्धतयोर्मेघयोर्गगने यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 51.2;
संबभूवातिबलिनोः सिंहकुञ्जरयोरिव। *Ibid.*, III. 27.10.
वृत्रवासवयोरिव। *Ibid.*, IV. 16.29;
गगने ग्रहयोर्धोरं बुधाङ्गारकयोरिव। *Ibid.*, IV. 12.17.

which form the subject of Vālmīki's picturesque descriptions. Sometimes it is friendship, or the King's solicitude for his subjects, or the latter's loyalty to the former. At other times, it is a brother's devotion or a sister's love which calls forth the latent powers of the poet. Let us begin by examining the images which occur in Vālmīki's description of love between man and woman and all that may be connected with it, for this subject assumes immense importance in later Sanskrit *Kāvya* literature, where its treatment can be better understood if one keeps in mind Vālmīki's way of dealing with it.

Love images come in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in two ways : indirectly, *i.e.*, when things are described in terms of love or the fair sex; directly, when the feelings of people who love each other are described. Students of Sanskrit literature know how the tendency exhibited in the former way becomes fully developed in later times and yields to the reader some of the best images ever known in Sanskrit. The *Rāmāyaṇa* gives us some of the earliest specimens of such images.

It is rather interesting to note how a river and a woman are intimately connected in the poet's imagination. In autumn, we are told, the course of rivers, which exhibit girdles in the form of lines of fishes, is rather slow, like that of women early in the morning when they are weary after the pleasures of love[1]. The sight of a river issuing from a mountain suggests to the poet the idea of a woman slipping off from the lap of her lover[2]. When the current of a river is checked by fallen trees, the poet thinks of an angry maiden kept off from her determined course

---

1. मीनोपसंदर्शितमेखलानां
नदीवधूनां गतयोऽद्य मन्दाः।
कान्तोपभुक्तालसगामिनीनां
प्रभातकालेष्विव कामिनीनाम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.54.

2. ददर्श च नगात्तस्मान्नदीं निपतितां कपिः।
अङ्कादिव समुत्पत्य प्रियस्य पतितां प्रियाम्।। *Ibid.*, V. 14.28.

by the friends of her lover[1]. In autumn, the rivers lose some of that abundance of water brought to them by the rains and the sand begins to show itself here and there. The poet says it is like shy women exposing their hips hesitatingly in their first unions with their lovers[2]. While describing the sleeping wives of Rāvaṇa it occurs to the poet that some of them are like rivers, with their hips corresponding to sandbanks[3]. In all these images, the water in a river seems to correspond to the flowing clothes of a woman. How these and similar images persist in later periods and what modifications they undergo is an altogether separate study, which the present writer has undertaken and the results of which he hopes someday to submit to the judgment of scholars. It will not, however, be out of place just to refer here to one or two verses of Kālidāsa, where the identification of river and a woman occurs. To him also, lives of fish in a river can represent the girdle going round the waist of a woman[4] and the sandbanks stand for her hips[5]. Speaking of Umā, he says that she, being smeared with white *agaru* and decorated with designs made of *gorocanā* surpassed the beauty of Gangā, with its sandbanks adorned with *'Cakravāka'* birds. And so on. It is not merely rivers which suggest to the poet the idea of a woman. Other collections of water can do the same. Ponds in autumn, we are told, with lines of swans for girdle, and lotuses

---

1. जलेन पतिताग्रैश्च पादपैरुपशोभितम्।
वार्यमाणामिव क्रुद्धां प्रमदां प्रियबन्धुभिः।। *Ibid.*, V. 14.30.

2. दर्शयन्ति शरन्नद्यः पुलिनानि शनैः शनैः।
नवसंगमसव्रीडा जघनानीव योषितः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.58.

3. आपगा इव ता रेजुर्जघनैः पुलिनैरिव। *Ibid.*, V. 9.51.

4. रवे व्यगाहत तरङ्गिणीमुमा
मीनपङ्क्तिपुनरुक्तमेखला। *Kumārasambhava*, VIII. 26.

5. चञ्चन्मनोज्ञशफरीरशनाकलापाः
पर्यन्तसंस्थितसिताण्डजपङ्क्तिहाराः।
नद्यो विशालपुलिनान्तनितम्बबिम्बाः
मन्दं प्रयान्ति समदाः प्रमदा इवाद्य।। *Ṛtu-saṁhāra*, III. 3.

for garland, have the supreme beauty of ornamented woman[1]. Nor is the comparison with a woman confined to collections of water, among all the objects of nature. In one place, we are told, that when the Sun moves on the South, the North, being deprived of it, is like a woman without her mark on her forehead[2]. In another place, it is suggested that the evening reddened by the setting Sun and having its stars brightened by the rays of the moon, is like a woman in love whose eyes open wide through the joy of being touched by the lover[3]. In a third place, it is the night with full moon for face, the bright stars for eyes and the white moonlight for garment which suggests comparison with a woman clad all in white[4].

If there is a special connection between a river and a woman in nature descriptions, it is the association of a male and a female elephant which seems to typify all romantic associations. Rāvaṇa surrounded by his wives looked like a male elephant surrounded by female ones in a forest[5]. On hearing Daśaratha's death, his wives screamed like female elephants in a forest when the leader of the herd has gone astray[6]. Sitā separated

---

1. प्रकीर्णहंसाकुलमेखलानां
प्रबुद्धपद्मोत्पलमालिनीनाम्।
वाप्युत्तमानामधिकाद्य लक्ष्मी–
र्वराङ्गनानामिव भूषितानाम्।। *Rāmā*, IV. 30.49.

2. सेवमाने दृढं सूर्ये दिशमन्तकसेविताम्।
विहीनतिलकेव स्त्री नोत्तरा दिक् प्रकाशते।। *Ibid.*, III. 16.8.

3. चञ्चच्चन्द्रकरस्पर्शहर्षोन्मीलिततारका।
अहो रागवती सन्ध्या जहातु स्वयमम्बरम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.45.

4. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितचारुवक्त्रा
तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा। I *Ibid.*, V. 30.45.
ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति
नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.46.

5. स राक्षसेन्द्रः शुशुभे ताभिः परिवृतः स्वयम्।
करेणुभिर्यथारण्ये परिकीर्णो यथा द्विपः।। *Ibid.*, V. 11.12.

6. ततः प्रचुक्रुशुर्दीनाः सस्वरं ता वराङ्गनाः
करेणव इवारण्ये स्थानप्रच्युतयूथपाः।। *Ibid.*, II. 65.21.

from Rāma was like a female elephant separated from the mate[1]. This idea persists throughout the history of Sanskrit literature. It is not a mere accident that, in the 3rd act of the *Uttararāmacarita*, Bhavabhūti introduces the incident of a young elephant being attached by a mroe grown up one, while enjoying the company of its mate[2]. Steeped as he was in the atmosphere of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and wishing to convey to the reader the intensity of Rāma's feelings during his separation from Sītā, he could not have thought of a better example than the separation of a happily united couple of elephants. It is this same psychology, in which the union of elephant couples, typifies all romantic unions, which makes Rāvaṇa tell the Rākṣasis :- "Bring Sītā round to my way of thinking, as one tames a young wild female elephant[3]." Sometimes, however, it is he cow and the bull which stand as a symbol of romantic union. This idea is present when the poet says that when Bharata entered Ayodhyā , the city looked like a cow deserted by the bull[4], or that Tārā mourned fallen Vālin as a cow mourns the bull killed by the lion[5], or that Rāvaṇa amidst his wives was like a bull among cows[6]. It must also be mentioned that the separation of the Cakravāka from its mate at night, destined to symbolize all separation of lovers in later Sanskrit literature, is already made use of in a few images in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[7].

---

1. गृहीतां लाडितां स्तम्भे यूथपेन विनाकृताम्।
   निश्वसन्तीं सुदुःखार्तां गजराजवधूमिव।।
2. सीतादेव्या स्वकरकलितैः शल्लकीपल्लवाग्रै–
   रग्रे लोलः करिकलभको यः पुरा पोषितोऽभूत्।
   वध्वा सार्धं पयसि विहरन् सोऽयमन्येन दपी–
   दुद्दामेन द्विरदपतिना सन्निपत्याभियुक्तः।। *Uttarramacarita*, III.6.
3. आनयध्वं वशं सर्वा वन्यां गजवधूमिव। *Rama.*, III. 56.31.
4. गोवृषेण परित्यक्तां गवां पत्नीमिवोत्सुकाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.9.
5. अहं पुत्रसहाया त्वामुपासे गतचेतनम्।
   सिंहेन पतितं सद्यो गौः सवत्सेव गोवृषम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 23.26.
6. गवां मध्ये यथा वृषः। *Ibid.*, V. 11-11.
7. सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी
   जनकसुता कृपणां दशां प्रपन्ना। *Ibid.*, V. 16.30.

So much about union of lovers in general. But the *Rāmāyaṇa* is primarily a description of the love of Rāma and Sītā and many are the images used to bring out its deep, noble, enduring and eternal character. Sītā belongs to Rāma as knowledge belongs to a Brahmin who has cultivated his soul[1]. The union of the two is pre-ordained. One cannot think of the one without the other. Sītā cannot leave Rāma any more than the lustre of the Sun leaves Meru[2]. The union of the two was as beautiful as that of the Moon with Rohiṇi[3] or Citrā[4], or of Viṣṇu with Lakṣmi[5]. It is just in this connection, while Sītā's devotion to Rāma is being described that one finds an allusion to old characters, legendary or historical, which is otherwise so rare a feature in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. While indignantly rejecting the request of the Rākṣasis to yield to Rāvaṇa, Sītā declares she is as devoted to Rāma as Śacī to Indra, as Arundhatī to Vasiṣṭha, as Rohiṇī to śaśin, as Lopāmudrā to Agastya, as Sukanyā to Cyavana, as Sāvitrī to Satyavān, as Śrīmatī to Kapila, as Madayantī to Sudāsa, as Keśinī to Sagara and as Damayantī to Naiṣadha[6]. More picturesque perhaps as an image is the statement that the wives of Rāvaṇa followed him as flashes of

---

1. अहमौपयिकी भार्या तस्यैव च धरापतेः।
   व्रतस्नातस्य विद्येव विप्रस्य विदितात्मनः।। *Ibid.*, V. 21.17.
2. न जहाति रता धर्मे मेरुमर्कप्रभा यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 40.24.
3. तया सुचरितं देव्या पुरा नूनं महत्तपः।
   रोहिणीव शशाङ्केन रामसंयोगमाप या।। *Ibid.*, II. 16.42.
4. उपेतं सीतया भूयश्चित्रया शशिनं यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 16.10.
   विरराज महाबाहुश्चित्रया चन्द्रमा यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 17.4.
5. अतीव रामः शुशुभे मुदान्वितो
   विभुः श्रिया विष्णुरिवामरेश्वरः। *Ibid.*, I. 77.29.
6. यथा शची महाभागा शक्रं समुपतिष्ठति।
   अरुन्धती वसिष्ठं च रोहिणी शशिनं यथा।
   लोपामुद्रा यथागस्त्यं सुकन्या च्यवनं यथा।।
   सावित्री सत्यवन्तं च कपिलं श्रीमती यथा।
   सौदासं मदयन्तीव केशिनी सगरं यथा।।
   नैषधं दमयन्तीव भैमी पतिमनुव्रता।। *Ibid.*, V. 24.9 and 2.

lightning follow the cloud[1]. The association of lightining and cloud has always typified the union of man and woman; a *fortiori*, that of Rāvaṇa, the huge dark, shapeless monster with his slim and graceful wife (cf. Mandodarī). Quite full of colour is the declaration of Rāvaṇa that Sītā has ravished his heart as the Garuḍa takes away his snake[2]. He is weary with love as a horse after a long journey[3]. Rāvaṇa's ignoble love for Sītā has stirred Vālmīki's imagination as few things have done and the result is a bunch of racy images. No two men can be more unlike each other than Rāma and Rāvaṇa. When the latter makes his ignoble proposal to Sītā, she rejects it saying that the difference between Rāma and him was the same as between gold and lead[4], sandal water and mud[5], the ocean and a petty rivulet[6], the elephant and a cat[7], the Garuḍa and the crow[8], the swan and the vulture[9]. Hence Rāvaṇa's desire for Sītā, Rā ma's wife, is as contemptible and as impossible of realisation as that of a jackal for a lioness[10]. He might as well drink *'Kālakūṭa'* poison and hope to remain healthy.[11] It is as dangerous as licking the blade of a razor[12], or walking on spikes[13] with metal points. It is as much beyond his power as trying

1. अनुजग्मुः पतिं वीरं घनं विद्युल्लता इव। *Ibid.*, V. 18.15.
2. मनो हरसि मे भीरु सुपर्णः पन्नगं यथा। *Ibid.*, V. 20.29.
3. श्रान्तोऽहं सततं कामाद्यातो हय इवाध्वनि। *Ibid.*, VI. 12.20.
4. यदन्तरं काञ्चनसीसलोहयोः। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46.
5. यदन्तरं चन्दनवारिपङ्कयोः। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46.
6. यदन्तरं स्यन्दनिकासमुद्रयोः। *Ibid.*, III. 47.45
7. यदन्तरं हस्तिबिडालयोर्वने। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46
8. यदन्तरं वायसवैनतेययोः। *Ibid.*, III. 47.47
9. यदन्तरं हंसकगृध्रयोर्वने। *Ibid.*, III. 47.47
10. त्वं पुनर्जम्बुकः सिंहीं मामिहेच्छसि दुर्लभाम्। *Ibid.*, III. 47.37
11. कालकूटविषं पीत्वा स्वस्तिमान् गन्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.40
12. जिह्वया लेढि च क्षुरम्। *Ibid.*, III. 47.41
13. अयोमुखानां शूलानां मध्ये चरितुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.44

to cross the ocean with a stone hanging round his neck[1], or deprive the Sun of its lustre[2], or take both the sun and the moon together in his hands[3]. For Rāvaṇa to touch Sītā is as outrageous as for a Cāṇḍāla to touch the altar in the middle of a sacrifice[4]. In taking Sītā away, Rāvaṇa does not realise that the knot of death is round his neck[5]. He is really tying on a snake to his clothes and does not know it[6]. Rāvaṇa wanting Sītā is trying to lift the Mandara mountain[7]. Sītā cannot respond to Rāvaṇa's love any more than twice-born can impart the Vedic *Mantra-s* to one who is not a twice-born[8]. Sītā, the true wife of Rāma, is as worthy of protection from the attacks of the wicked as the Veda from arguments full of logic[9]. Sugrīva promises Rāma to bring Sītā back as one brings back a lost Veda[10]. And so on.

So much for love of the Romantic type. Coming now to parental and filial love, it would surprise no one to hear that it is symbolised in the *Rāmāyaṇa* by the love of the cow for the calf. Kausalyā declares that she would follow Rāma to the forest as a cow follows its calf[11]. Rāma says his heart melts

---

1. अवसज्ज्य शिलां कण्ठे समुद्रं तर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.42.
2. इच्छसि प्रसभं हर्तुं प्रभामिव विवस्वतः। *Ibid.*, III. 37.14.
3. सूर्यचन्द्रमसौ चोभौ पाणिभ्यां हर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.43.
4. न शक्या यज्ञमध्यस्था वेदिः स्रग्भाण्डमण्डिता।
   द्विजातिमन्त्रसंपूता चण्डालेनायमर्दितुम्।। *Ibid.*, III. 56.18.
5. ग्रीवायां प्रतिमुक्तं च कालपाशं न पश्यसि। *Ibid.*, III. 50.17.
6. सर्पमाशीविषं बद्धा वस्त्रान्ते नावबुध्यसे। *Ibid.*, III. 50.17.
7. मन्दरं पर्वतश्रेष्ठं पाणिना हर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.40.
8. भावं न चास्याहमनुप्रदातु–
   मलं द्विजो मन्त्रमिवाव्रिजाय। *Ibid.*, V. 28.
9. न शक्तस्त्वं बलाद्धर्तुं वैदेहीं मम पश्यतः।
   हेतुभिर्न्यायसंयुक्तैर्ध्रुवां वेदश्रुतीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 50.22.
10. अहं तामानयिष्यामि नष्टां वेदश्रुतीमिव। *Ibid.*, IV. 6.5.
11. कथं हि धेनुः स्वं वत्सं गच्छन्तमनुगच्छति।
    अहं त्वानुगमिष्यामि यत्र वत्स गमिष्यसि।। *Ibid.*, II. 24.9.

on seeing the jewel sent to him by Sītā as a cow melts on seeing the calf[1]. Sometimes it is the mare and the colt which stand for parental love. Kausalyā runs to Rāma as a mare runs to a colt[2]. At one place, it is stated that Sumitrā without Lakṣmaṇa was like a branch of Karṇikāra without flowers, the idea being, of course, that chief ornament of a mother was her son[3]. Equally picturesque is the statement thar Rāma was Daśaratha's life walking abroad[4]. Usually, however, this image is used of brothers devoted to each other. Thus it is stated many times that Lakṣmaṇa is Rāma's life walking abroad[5]. Sometimes he is to be Rāma's right hand. The two Aśvins are, however, the symbol of brotherly affection[6]. Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma, Vālin and Sugrīva were devoted to each other like the two Aśvins[7]. Two brothers like Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, lending strength to each other, are like fire and wind[8].

Some images relating to friendship are rather noteworthy. Most of them dwell, however, on the negative aspect of it i.e., when it is not properly appreciated[9]. Friendship shown toward, the ignoble, we are told, is like water flowing on lotus leaves. Neither makes any impression on the recepient. Or, it is like clouds soaring in autumn. It produces nothing. If indulged in, it ends badly, like an elephant bathing first and then covering

1. यथैव धेनुः स्रवति स्नेहाद्वत्सस्य वत्सला।
   तथा ममापि हृदयं मणिश्रेष्ठस्य दर्शनात्।। *Ibid.*, V. 66.3.
2. अभिचक्राम संहृष्टा किशोरं वडवा यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 20.20.
3. कर्णिकारस्य शाखेव शीर्णपुष्पा वनान्तरे। *Ibid.*, II. 92.23.
4. बहिश्च इव प्राणो बभूव गुणतः प्रियः। *Ibid.*, II. 1.19.
5. रामस्य दक्षिणो बाहुर्नित्यं प्राणो बहिश्चरः। *Ibid.*, III. 34.14.
6. अश्विनोरिव सौभ्रात्रं तयोर्लोकेषु विश्रुतम्। *Ibid.*, II. 8.31.
7. अन्योन्यसदृशौ वीरावुभौ देवाविवाश्विनौ। *Ibid.*, IV. 2.19.
8. स तेन सह संयुक्तः पावकेनानिलो यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 31.17.
9. यथा पुष्करपत्रेषु पतितास्तोयबिन्दवः।
   न श्लेषमभिगच्छन्ति तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.12.

itself with mud[1]. It is as useless as a bee drinking the *Kāśapuspa* and finding no honey in it[2]. To live with one who pretends to be a friend, but who is really not so, is taking a very great risk. Better to live with one's enemy or with an angry snake rather than with such a person[3]. Kaikeyī appeared to the poet to be such a person in her behaviour towards Daśaratha. In marrying her and living with her, Daśaratha did not know that he was touching a black snake in the dark[4]. He failed to realise that he was really embracing fire[5]. In his agony he exclaims that he had brought about his own destruction by keeping a serpent in his lap for too long[6]. He had been cheated by a woman hiding her real nature, as by fire covered with ashes[7]. It is interesting to note that this very image is used by the poet on another occasion to describe hidden talent or splendour. Sugrīva says that Rāma's ability and talent are not quite conspicuous. They are like fire covered with ashes[8]. One who pretends to be a friend, but who is really not one, is like a serpent, crying like a frog to attract and catch it[9]. It will be seen that the poet's views about friendship are, on the whole, rather pessimistic.

---

1. यथा पूर्वे गजः स्नात्वा गृह्य हस्तेन वै रजः।
   दूषयत्यात्मनो देहं तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.15.
2. यथा मधुकरस्तर्षात् काशपुष्पं पिबन्नपि।
   रसमत्र न विन्देत तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.14.
3. वसेत् सह सपत्नेन क्रुद्धेनाशीविषेण च।
   न तु मित्रप्रवादेन संवसेच्छत्रुसेविना।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.2.
4. बालो रहसि हस्तेन कृष्णसर्पमिवास्पृशम्। *Ibid.*, II. 12.81.
5. अङ्गारमुपगूह्य स्म पिता में नावबुद्धवान्। *Ibid.*, II. 73.4.
6. चिरं बताङ्केन धृतासि सर्पी
   महाविषा तेन हतोऽस्मि मोहात्। *Ibid.*, II. 12.105.
7. छन्नया चलितस्त्वस्मि स्त्रिया भस्माग्निकल्पया। *Ibid.*, II. 34.46.
8. कामं राघव ते वाणी प्रमाणं धैर्यमाकृतिः।
   सूचयन्ति परं तेजो भस्मच्छन्नमिवानलम् *Ibid.*, IV. 11.81.
9. न त्वां रामो विजानीते सर्पे मण्डूकराविणम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 34.15.

When, we come to the relation between a king and his subjects, the picture is not so one-sided. There are many images illustrative of the love and devotion existing between good kings and their subjects. People watch Rāma go to see his father and they now await his return as the ocean awaits the rise of the moon[1]. Bharata tells Rāma who was unwilling to return to Ayodhyā that people await his return as the cultivators wait for rain[2]. Subjects are distressed by Rāma's departure as water animals by the drying-up of water in summer[3]. A good king is like the very eye of his subjects[4]. Even more picturesque are the images used to describe bad kings. Subjects despice a greedy king as they do the fire at the crematorium[5]. People ruled by a bad king are as pitiable as deer protected by a jackal[6]. Subjects avoid a foolish king as elephants avoid mud at the river? We have thus briefly passed in a review the contents of the Imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Such a survey, would, however, not be complete if we did not say a few words about the forms in which the contents are couched and examine the relation between them. That is what we propose to do in our next and concluding section.

It is a remarkable fact that in spite of the antiquity and the age long reputation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as a *'Kāvya'*, writers on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* have not turned to if for preference for their illustrations. Not that references to the *Rāmāyaṇa* are totally absent

---

1. प्रतीक्षसे तस्य पुनः स्म निर्गमं
   यथोदयं चन्द्रमसः सरित्पतिः। *Ibid.*, II. 12.22.
2. त्वामेव हि प्रतीक्षन्ते पर्जन्यमिव कर्षकाः। *Ibid.*, II. 112.12.
3. तस्मात्तस्योपघातेन प्रजाः परमपीडिताः।
   औदकानीव सत्वानि ग्रीष्मे सलिलसंक्षयात्।। *Ibid.*, II. 33.13.
4. यथा दृष्टिः शरीरस्य नित्यमेव प्रवर्तते।
   तथा नरेन्द्रो रामस्य प्रभवः सत्यधर्मयोः।। *Ibid.*, II. 67.33.
5. लुब्धं न बहु मन्यन्ते श्मशानग्निमिव प्रजाः। *Ibid.*, III. 33.3.
6. रक्ष्यमाणा न वर्धन्ते मृगा गोमायुना यथा। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.42.
7. वर्जयन्ति नरा दूरं नदीपङ्कमिव द्विजाः। *Ibid.*, III. 33.5.

in works on *Alankāraśāstra*. The work is frequently mentioned, together with the *Mahābhārata* as a source from which a poet might borrow his subject matter. The history of Sanskrit literature also shows to what extent it has been so used by poets right up to modern times. It is, however, true to say in a general manner that the *Rāmāyaṇa* plays a comparatively small part in the thousands of *śloka-s* which are given as illustrations of the different theories of poetics in the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. Whether it be the *Alankāra* or the *Rīti* or the *Dhvani* or the *Vakrokti* system, it is from the later classical literature, from the works of authors like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha that critics primarily draw their examples, and not from the *'Ādikāvya'*.

It is not that *Rāmāyaṇa* cannot furnish illustrations of the *Alaṅkāra-s*. The best proof of it is that the commentators do occasionally point out different *Alaṅkāra-s* in the verses of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. But they only point the well-known ones and do not say anything which has a historical value.

The most recent study of the form of the *Alaṅkāra-s* from the historical point of view is found in Mr. Diwekar's *"Les fleurs de rhetorique dans I' Inde"* p. 35-53 (Paris, 1930). The author draws attention to those ornamental devices for which the poet seems to have a preference and those which he holds to be the poet's own invention. Among the former, he mentions the repetition of syllables which from part of different words : वानराणां नराणां च पुरस्यान्तःपुरस्य च; the repetition of similar sounds in a verse or in a stanza : परिकुपितं पितरं पाति पातीतः; the use of rhyme consisting in the repetition of the same word at a definite place in the verse, the use of *Arthālaṅkāra-s* like *Upamā, Rūpaka,* etc. The author is of opinion that we can see in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the development of the *Alaṅkāra-s*, *Upameyopamā* and *Ananvaya*. Among the devices which he considers Vālmīki's own invention, Mr. Diwekar mentions the combinations of *Śabdālaṅkāra-s* and *Arthālaṅkāra-s*, the particular kind of rhyme called *Śṛṅkhalāyamaka* :

Rāvaṇam bhaja bhartāram bhartaram sarvarakṣasām. And even the use of such expressions as (1) the repetition of the word 'क' in order to indicate difference between two things (2) नैतच्चित्रम्.

It must be said in regard to the above that it is possible to establish preference by mere counting, whereas one feels a certain diffidence when it comes to attributing to the poet the invention of particular devices. Form is something which is meant to be the same in all writers. A good deal of the work of commentators consists in pointing out the same forms in the *Alaṅkāra-s* of the different writers. Poetic theory also assumes that the form of imagery is the same in the case of all writers. Indeed, poets are expected to conform themselves to the definition of the forms given in the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. If one analyses the *Alaṅkāra-s* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* one is likely to come across practically all the *Alaṅkāras* which have been defined and analysed in the *Śāstra*. Some may, of course, be found more frequently used than others, but that is due to the inherent nature of the *Alaṅkāra-s* themselves. In these circumstances, to say about a particular *Alaṅkāra* that it is the invention of Vālmīki requires a good knowlegde of contemporary and antecedent literature. The most that one can perhaps say is that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the earliest known work in which a particular *Alaṅkāra* occurs and I take it that this is what Mr. Diwekar means when he calls a particular *Alaṅkāra* an invention of Vālmīki.

Things are slightly different when it comes to the contents of an *Alaṅkāra*. Here it is that even poetic theory and ancient tradition expect a poet to show his originality and power of invention. Also, the contents of an *Alaṅkāra* can, in some cases, come only out of individual minds, specially gifted minds. When Kālidāsa says : मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः, one feels that not everybody could think of such a comparison.

It does not require a genius to invent the particular form of *Alaṅkāra* called *Upamā*. Perhaps it would be difficult for most of us to speak for half an hour continuously without introducing *Upamā* into our speech. Such *Upamā* would perhaps not be poetic, but to say of an Upamā that it is poetic or not is to make a distinction in contents and not in form.

When one feels diffidence in attributing a particular form of *Alaṅkāra* to the inventive power of Vālmīki, what to say of such expressions as the repetition of क, and the use of नैतच्चित्रम् ? I feel that these have always been part of the everyday speech of the people and do not depend upon a genius for their existence.

As was said before Mr. Diwekar's study in an attempt to determine the part which the *Rāmāyaṇa* has played in the evolution of the forms of Sanskrit imagery. The series of sections of which this is the last, has been a study of the contents of the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the previous sections, an attempt was made to determine the particular occasions on which images appear in abundance and the particular objects which are brought in to describe particular things. In the present section, I wish to do no more than make a few observations on the relation between content and form in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

It is not always possible to establish a relation of cause and effect between form and image. One can, however, establish certain associations, certain contents which always appear together with certain forms.

Mr. Diwekar has already pointed out the occurrence of continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (p. 48). He has, however, said nothing about their contents. To me, they seem worthy of observation. A continued metaphor is a comparison involving complete identification between two things and their parts. The standard of comparison must, therefore, be something complex,

something having parts. Certain complex things have, therefore, become fixed in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and, as will be shown, persist in the later literature also.

It is but natural that the immense ocean, with its ever surging waves and the inexhaustible life within it, should occur to the poet when anything complex had to be described. Thus the grief of Daśaratha at the departure of Rāma to the forest is compared to the ocean. Once the identification between the ocean and grief was made, it had to be followed up, to be justified so to speak and the result is that we get a series of identifications of the parts of both. Daśaratha declares to Kausalyā that it is impossible for him to cross the ocean of grief. This ocean has sighs for waves and whirlpools; it is muddy with the current of tears; its fishes are the throwing about of arms in despair; its roar is weeping; its weeds are dishevelled hair; its mare *(Vadvā)* is Kaikeyī; it is the result of Daśaratha's tears; the words of the Kubjā (Mantharā) are its crocodiles and its coasts are extensive, as it would last as long or Rāma is banished.[1] The simple identification of grief and ocean is common enough. Even the English expression "plunged in grief" is a reminder that grief can be thought of a collection of water. What is noteworthy in the above example is the attempt to push the identification to its logical conclusion, even at the risk of seeming artificial. The ocean appears again and again in such complex metaphors. Thus, Śūrpaṇakhā aska Rāvaṇa "Why do you not protect me when I am plunged in the ocean of grief, inhabited by crocodiles in the form of chagrin and waves in the form

---

1. श्वसितोर्मिमहावर्तो बाष्पवेगजलाविलः।
बाहुविक्षेपमीनोऽसौ विक्रन्दितमहास्वनः।।
प्रकीर्णकेशशैवालः कैकेयीवडवामुखः।
ममाश्रुवेगप्रभवः कुब्जावाक्यमहाग्रहः।।
वरवेलो नृशंसाया रामप्रव्राजनायतः।
यस्मिन् बत निमग्नोऽहं कौसल्ये राघवं विना।। *Rāmā*, II. 59. 28-31.

of trembling" ?[1] On another occasion, it is the sky which is identified with the ocean. We are told that Hanumān flew across the sky which was a veritable ocean. The moon in the sky corresponds to the lotus; the sun to Kāraṇḍava; the stars Tiṣya and Śravaṇa to Kadamba birds; clouds to weeds; the star Punarvasu to big fish; Lohitānga to crocodiles and Airāvata to big islands.[2] The sky, like the ocean, strikes one by its complexity and it is, therefore, perfectly intelligible that the two are identified as wholes as well as in their parts. An equally intelligible identification is that of the army of the gods with the ocean. In this identification, the weapons Śakti and Tomara are the fishes, scattered arms are the weeds, horses are frogs, elephants are turtles, Rudra and Āditya are the big crocodiles; the Maruts and the Vasus are the snakes; chariots, horses and elephants are its water currents and infantry, the sandy shores[3]. The above examples are sufficient to prove the frequency with which the ocean appears in continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Nor is it confined to the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It occurs in the later literature also. For instance, Aśvaghoṣa says in his *'Saundarānanda'* that the Buddha crossed the ocean of evils in which *Upādhi* was the water, *Ādhi*, the

---

1. विषादनक्राध्युषिते परित्रासोर्मिमालिनि।
किं मां न त्रायसे मग्नां विपुले शोकसागरे।। *Ibid.*, III. 21-22.

2. सचन्द्रकुमुदं रम्यं सार्ककारण्डवं शुभम्।
तिष्यश्रवणकादम्बमभ्रशैवालशाद्वलम्।।
पुनर्वसुमहामीनं लोहितागमहाग्रहम्।
ऐरावतमहाद्वीपं स्वातीहंसविलासितम्।।
वातसङ्घातजालोर्मि चन्द्रांशुशिशिरांशुमत्।
हनुमानपरिश्रान्तः पुप्लुव गगनार्णवम्।। *Ibid.*, V. 57. 2-4.

3. शक्तितोमरमीनं च विनिकीर्णास्त्रशैवलम्।
गजकच्छपसम्बाधमश्वमण्डूकसंकुलम्।।
रुद्रादित्यमहाग्राहं मरुद्वसुमहोरगम्।
रथाश्वगजतोयौघं पदातिपुलिनं महत्।।
अनेन हि समासाद्य देवानां बलसागरम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 7.20.

water-animals, anger, intoxication and fear, the waves.[1] Again, he says in his *'Buddhacarita'* that the Buddha will make the world cross the ocean of sorrow by means of the boat of knowledge. In this ocean, the diseases are the foam, oldage the waves, and death the current.[2]

Sometimes it is the river which takes the place of the ocean. We are told that the battle ground is like a river. The dead heroes are the banks; broken arms, the great trees; streams of blood, the water; death, the ocean to which it leads; liver and spleen, the mud; scattered entrails, the weeds; broken limbs and heads, the fish; the vultures, swans; the herons, the *Sārasa* birds and human fat, the foam.[3] Following Vālmiki, Aśvaghoṣa says in his *Buddhacarita* that the thirsty world will drink from the river of *Dharma*, having the current of wisdom, banks in the form of firm conduct, cool through *Samādhi* and having *Cakravāka-s* in the form of vows.[4]

It is not only collections of water like the ocean and

---

1. स हि दोषसागरमगाधमुपाधिजलमाधिजन्तुकम्।
क्रोधमदभयतरङ्गचलं प्रततार लोकमपि चाप्यतारयत्।। *Saun.* III. 14

2. दुःखार्णवादप्याधिविकीर्णफेनाज्जरातङ्गन्मरणोग्रवेगात्।
उत्तारयिष्यत्ययमुद्यमानमार्ते जगज्ज्ञानमहाप्लवेन।। *Buddhacarita.*, 1. 75

3. हतवीरौघवप्रां तु भग्नायुधमहाद्रुमाम्।
शोणितौघमहातोयां यमसागरगामिनीम्।।
यकृत्प्लीहमहापङ्कां विनिकीर्णान्त्रशैवलाम्।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
गृध्रहंसवराकीर्णां कङ्कसारससेविताम्।
मेदःफेनसमाकीर्णामावर्तस्वननिःस्वनाम्।
तां कापुरुषदुस्तारां युद्धभूमिमयीं नदीम्।
नदीमिव घनापाये हँससारससेविताम्।। *Rāmā*, VI. 58. 29-32.

4. प्रज्ञाम्बुवेगां स्थिरशीलवप्रां
समाधिशीतां व्रतचक्रवाकाम्।
अस्योत्तमां धर्मनदीं प्रवृत्तां
तृष्णार्दितः पास्यति जीवलोकः।। *Buddhacarita.*, I. 76

the river which appear in continued metaphors. Sometimes, it is fire which takes their place. The simple metaphor 'fire of sorrow' is almost a common place in Sanskrit literature and there is, therefore, nothing surprising in its occurring in continued metaphors. Thus Kausalyā says that the fire of sorrow, fanned by the separation of Rāma, fed by the fuel of lamentation, having offerings in the form of weeping and smoke in the form of anxiety and tears etc., will consume her in the absence of Rāma.[1] As in the *Rāmāyaṇa,* so in later literature also, fire continued to appear in continued metaphors. Thus, in the *Buddacarita,* we are told that Rāhula, son of the Buddha, being burnt by the fire of sorrow, to which separation from the Buddha added fresh fuel, whose smoke was sighs and flame, despair, goes to see him outside and inside the palace.[2] In another passage, Rāma himself is compared to fire. In this state arrows are his sparks, and bow and dagger, his fuel.[3]

Another object which plays an important part in continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as well as in the later literature is the snake. Kumbhakarṇa asks Rāvaṇa : "O king ! who brought you the snake in the form of Sitā, whose chest is its coils, anxiety concerning whom is its poison, whose smile is its fangs and

---

1. अयं तु मामात्मभवस्तवादर्शनमारुतः।
विलापदुःखसमिधो रुदिताश्रुहुताहुतिः।।
चिन्तावाष्पमहाधूमस्तवागमनचिन्तजः।
कर्शयित्वाधिकं पुत्र निःश्वासायाससंभवः।।
त्वया विहीनामिह मां शोकाग्निरतुलो महान्।
प्रधक्ष्यति यथा कक्ष्यं चित्रभानुर्हिमात्यये।। *Rāmā,* II. 24-6-7-8.

2. शोकाग्निना त्वद्विरहेन्धनेन
निःश्वासधूमेन तमःशिखेन।
त्वद्दर्शनायर्च्छति दह्यमानः
सोऽन्तःपुरं चैव पुरं च कृत्स्नम्।। *Buddhacarita.,* IX. 29

3. शरार्चिषमनाधृष्यं चापखड्गेन्धनं रणे।
रामाग्नि सहसा दीप्तं न प्रवेष्टुं त्वमर्हसि।। *Rāmā,* III. 37.15.

whose fine fingers are its fine heads ?"[1] Vālmīki seems to have a preference for the five-headed snake on such occasions. Lakṣmaṇa, in his anger, looked like a five-headed snake with arrows for tongue, its string for coils and his own lustre for poison.[2] Similarly in the *Saundarananda*, Nanda says to the Buddha : "I have been bitten in the heart by the snake in the form of love, having evil for hood, destruction for glance, blunder for fangs and ignorance for poison; give me, therefore, an antedote, O great physician !"[3]

The army itself is a sufficiently complex thing to appear in such metaphors. The clouds, we are told, with banners in the shape of lightning and emitting a roar in the form of thunderbolt like an army of monkeys ready for batlle.[4]

The above examples do not exhaust the list of objects which appear in complex metaphors. In the beautiful description of the rainy season occurring in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, we are told there is music in the forests. In this music, the buzzing of bees is the *Viṇā*; time is marked by the cries of monkeys and

---

1. वृतो हि बाहन्तरभोगराशि–
श्चिन्ताविषः सस्मिततीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रः।
पञ्चाङ्गुलीपञ्चशिरोऽतिकायः।
सीतामहाहिस्तव केन राजन्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 14.2.

2. बाणशल्यस्फुरज्जिह्वः सायकासनभोगवान्।
स्वतेजोविषसंभूतः पञ्चास्य इव पन्नगः।। *Ibid.*, IV 31.30

3. अनर्थभोगेन विघातदृष्टिना
प्रमाददंष्ट्रेण तमोविषाग्निना।
अहं हि दष्टो हृदि मन्मथाग्निना
विधत्स्व तस्मादगदं महाभिषक्।। *Saundarā*, X. 55

4. तडित्पताकाभिरलंकृताना–
मुदीर्णगम्भीरमहारवाणाम्।
विभान्ति रूपाणि बलाहकानां
रणोत्सुकानामिव वानराणाम्।। *Rāmā*,, IV. 28.31

the roar of clouds corresponds to the sound of Mṛdaṅga.[1] Music appears again in the indignant speech of Rāvaṇa when he hears that Rāma has come to Laṅkā to fight him. He says : "I shall descend on the stage of the battlefield and play my lute in the form of my bow, with the bow in the form of arrows."[2] In the description of the rainy season referred to above, the sky is identified with a lover. In this identification, gentle breeze forms the sigh, the reddish hue of sunset corresponds to sandal paste and the pale clouds to the pale face of the lover.[3] In an equally beautiful description of the autumn occurring also in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇda,* the night is identified with a woman. The moon is her face, the stars are the eyes, and the moonlight her clothes.[4] More prosaic is an identification of Rāma with a tree, the flowers and fruits being Sītā and the branches being Sugrīva, Jāmbavan, Kumuda and Nala.[5] More striking, perhaps, is the comparison between mountains and *Brahmacārins* : the clouds are the *Kṛṣṇājina,* being dark in colour; streams are the sacred thread, being bright and flowing; the caves being filled with air by the wind corresponds to the taking in of

---

1. षट्पादतन्त्रीमधुराभिधानं प्लवङ्गमोदीरितकण्ठतालम्।
आविष्कृतं मेघमृदङ्गनादैर्वनेषु संगीतमिव प्रवृत्तम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 36.

2. मम चापमयीं वीणां शरकोणैः प्रवादिताम्।
ज्याशब्दतुमुलां घोरामार्तगीतमहास्वनाम्।।
नाराचतलसन्नादां नदीमहितवादिनाम्।
अवगाह्य महारङ्गं वादयिष्याम्यहं रणे।। *Ibid.*, VI. 24. 42-43.

3. मन्दमारुतनिःश्वासं सन्ध्याचन्दनरञ्जितम्।
आपाण्डुजलदं भाति कामातुरमिवाम्बरम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 6.

4. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितसौम्यवक्त्रा
तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा।
ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति
नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30. 46.

5. रामवृक्षं रणे हन्मि सीतापुष्पफलप्रदम्।
प्रशाखा यस्य सुग्रीवो जाम्बवान् कुमुदो नलः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 100. 4.

breath or *Prāṇāyāma.*[1]

The above examples are sufficient to show the kind of object that figure in continued metaphors and the historical interest which they have in view of their persistence in later times. The association of form and contents which we find in the above example is the most striking of all in the *Rāmāyaṇa.*

Summing up the results of this study, we have found that imagery comes forth more spontaneously and in greater abundance in descriptions of nature and in speeches made by the different characters when they are under the stress of some emotion. The objects to which persons, or ideas, or situations are compared are chiefly drawn from nature. Though Vālmīki has incorporated into his work much popular imagery which was due to the inventive faculty of no particular writer, there is also in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, much that could have been the creation of individual minds. The contents of Vālmīki's imagery persist to a very great extent in later works, whose works can, therefore, be better understood with reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa.* To determine the exact relation between Vālmīki and the later writers is a separate study.

❑ ❑ ❑

1. मेघकृष्णाजिनधरा धारायज्ञोपवीतिनः।
मारुतापूरितगुहाः प्राधीता इव पर्वताः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 10.